DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 735 FL 801 415

AUTHOR Harrell, Edith Lynn
TITLE Helping Adult ESOL Students Increase Speaking and Listening Skills by Serving as Volunteers in Authentic Settings.
PUB DATE 2000-08-14
NOTE 143p.; Practicum Paper, Nova Southeastern University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Check Lists; *English (Second Language); Instructional Materials; Interviews; Limited English Speaking; *Listening Skills; Mentors; Participant Observation; Peer Teaching; Pretests Posttests; Questionnaires; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Speech Skills; *Tutoring; Vocational Education; Volunteers
IDENTIFIERS Partner Reading

ABSTRACT

This practicum paper documents a program that was developed and implemented to help adult, advanced English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students increase their speaking and listening skills and build self confidence with native English speakers. The objective was to increase group average exit test scores in speaking and listening by at least two points over the current average of 43; increase students' average self-confidence post-test score by at least 5 points over the pre-test score, for 100% of a randomly-selected group of teachers to approve a manual created for this project. Strategies for pairing ESL students with mentors in various businesses and academic departments throughout a vocational or technical school where students served as aides to instructional and non-instructional personnel are discussed. All objectives were met, and the appendix includes forms and a sample teachers' manual. Seventeen appendices containing checklists, data tables, questionnaires, and various other forms and materials and 38 references are included. (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

FL

ED 447 735

HELPING ADULT ESOL STUDENTS INCREASE SPEAKING AND LISTENING SKILLS BY SERVING AS VOLUNTEERS IN AUTHENTIC SETTINGS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

Edith Lynn Harrell

Edith Harrell

1

A Final Report submitted to the Faculty of the Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education of Nova Southeastern University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Educational Specialist

An abstract of this report may be placed in the University database system for reference.

August 14, 2000

FL 801 410

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Helping Adult ESOL Students Increase Speaking and Listening Skills by Serving as Volunteers in Authentic Settings. Harrell, Edith Lynn, 2000. Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University, Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education.

Descriptors: ESOL/ Adult ESOL/ Adult Education/ ESOL Speaking Skills/ ESOL Listening Skills/ Volunteers/ Authentic Settings.

This program was developed and implemented to help adult, advanced ESOL students increase speaking/listening skills commensurate with reading/writing skills, and build self-confidence during oral communication with native English speakers. Objectives were to increase group average exit test score in speaking/listening by at least two points over current average of 43; increase students' average self-confidence post-test score by at least 5 points over pre-test score;for 100% of randomly-selected group of teachers to approve a manual created for the project. Strategies were pairing ESOL students with mentors in various business and academic departments throughout an adult high school/vocational/technical school where students served as aides to instructional and non-instructional personnel. All the objectives were met. Appendixes include forms and a teachers' manual for replication.

Authorship Statement

I hereby testify that this paper and the work it reports are entirely my own. When it has been necessary to draw from the work of others, published or unpublished, I have acknowledged such work in accordance with accepted scholarly and editorial practice. I give this testimony freely, out of respect for the scholarship of others in the field and in the hope that my own work, presented here, will earn similar respect.

Edith Lynn Hamer
student's signature

Document Release

Permission is hereby given to Nova Southeastern University to distribute copies of this applied research project on request from interested parties. It is my understanding that Nova Southeastern University will not charge for this dissemination other than to cover the costs of duplicating, handling, and mailing of the materials.

Edith Lynn Hamer
student's signature

8/14/00
date

Nova Southeastern University
Fischler Center for the
Advancement of Education

PROJECT VERIFICATION FORM

Dear Mentor:

Practicum students in Nova Southeastern University's GTEP programs for master's and educational specialist degrees are asked to provide verification that the project activities reported in this document took place as described. On this sheet please write a brief overview attesting to your knowledge of the project activity reported in the accompanying document. Note that you are not asked to evaluate or make judgements about the quality of the project on this page.

Practicum title Helping ESOL students increase speaking and listening skills by serving as volunteers in authentic settings

Student's name Edith Harrell Completion date

Project site Manatee Technical Institute - Adult Education

Mentor's name Ray Ciemniecki (print) Ray Ciemniecki (signature)

Mentor's position at the site Principal Phone #941-751-7900 x1201

Comment on impact of the project (handwritten):

This project enriched both our ESOL students and our entire campus. By placing ESOL students in several active areas of our campus and having them interact with our faculty, students and the general public helped the ESOL students with their English language skills. It also made others on our campus more aware of the scope of our ESOL program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapters	
I. Purpose	1
II. Research and Planned Solution Strategy	16
III. Method	56
IV. Results	71
V. Recommendations	77
Reference List	80
Appendixes	
Appendix A: Academic Skills Literacy Completion (LCP) Checklist	86
Appendix B: Scoring the Expressways Placement Test (EPT)	89
Appendix C: Student Confidence and Usage Survey	91
Appendix D: Structured Student Interview	93
Appendix E: Target Group Pre-Test Scores	95
Appendix F: Matrix of Activities	97
Appendix G: Mentor Needs Assessment Checklist	99
Appendix H: Student Skills and Preference Checklist	101
Appendix I: Student Daioy Activity Checklist	103
Appendix J: Daily Monitoring Checklist	105
Appendix K: Mentor's Final Evaluation Questionnaire	107

Page

Appendix L: Student Final Evaluation Questionnaire 109

Appendix M: Teacher's Manual Rating Questionnaire 111

Appendix N: Comparison of Students' Pre- and Post-Test Scores 113

Appendix O: Teachers' Manual 115

Appendix P: Results: Mentors' Final Evaluation Questionnaire 130

Appendix Q: Results: Students' Final Evaluation Questionnaire 132

CHAPTER 1

Purpose

Background

The setting for this practicum project was an adult high school (AHS) which served students throughout the district whose needs fell outside the normal parameters of the standard high school. AHS was the largest high school in the district, with 3547 students on its main campus and at satellite locations within the district. The teaching staff was comprised of 62 full-time and part-time instructors. There were 14 different businesses and service agencies throughout the district who provided facilities on their premises for classes in basic literacy, GED preparation, and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and who contracted with the school board for certified instructors from AHS. The adult high school was allied with the district's vocational/technical institute, which occupied the same campus.

The adult high school had an open enrollment policy (open entry/open exit), so students in any program could enter or leave at any time during the school year. Attendance policies were more flexible than at regular high schools. These enrollment and attendance policies were essential for

serving the needs of the maximum possible number of students, especially those with children or full-time jobs. The curriculum was competency-based, allowing students to work at their own pace.

The adult high school offered programs in four major areas. Adult Basic Education (ABE) addressed the needs of native English speakers whose reading test scores on the Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) were below 8.0. Through individualized classroom instruction and computer programs, students' proficiencies in basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics were raised to the minimum TABE score of 9.0, needed to enter the GED Preparation Program.

The GED Preparation Program prepared students to pass the GED test. The time students spent in this program varied according to their individual needs and progress.

The Credit Diploma Program was available for students who had completed more than 12 of the 24 required high school credits needed for a regular high school diploma, and who wished to obtain a credit diploma rather than a GED.

The ESOL Program was the largest program at AHS, with an enrollment of 1853 students, ranging in age from 18 to 68 years. Eighty-five percent of them were between the ages of 20 and 35. The program was offered on every proficiency level from pre-literacy to advanced, in both day and evening classes, on the main campus and in satellite locations.

Student placement levels in the ESOL Program were determined by scores on the TABE, through faculty evaluations of speaking and listening during an interview, and, specifically, on oral and written scores on the Expressways Placement Test (EPT) (1998).

The ESOL student population, especially in the lower proficiency levels, varied throughout the year. This occurred for two main reasons. First, in addition to a year-round population of 225,000, the county had large agricultural interests which employed seasonal migrant workers. Therefore, AHS ESOL students from this migrant population might only stay in school for a few months each year. Second, many students from other countries came to the United States specifically to study English, and were limited by their visas to certain time restrictions for length of stay. So the greatest student enrollment in AHS's ESOL classes occurred each year from the beginning of October through the end of May. Daytime classes were generally smaller than evening classes since many students worked during the day and attended classes at night. Lower proficiency level day classes averaged 15 to 25 students, and upper level day classes averaged 10 to 15 students.

The Director of the ESOL Program at AHS stated that the general ESOL population at the school could be roughly divided into two categories, based on students' needs and goals. The first category was comprised of those students who were

primarily interested in learning English survival skills which would enable them to obtain and keep minimum-skill, minimum-wage jobs, either in agriculture or in basic service industries, such as restaurants or janitorial occupations. For many of these students, their native language remained their primary language, and English simply allowed them to interact as necessary with the English-speaking community around them. They usually left the ESOL Program after completing the first two or three proficiency levels.

The second category was comprised of students who were primarily interested in English as a tool for advancement in their chosen careers/professions. Some students in this group intended to stay in the United States, to obtain a GED or college degree, and to become successful U.S. residents. Others in the group returned to their native countries where their new proficiency in English would be the key to advancement in their chosen fields. Approximately 75% of the students in this second category studied English prior to coming to the U.S., and many were college-educated, or even licensed professionals in their own countries. Their goal was to become bilingual, since higher level jobs in the U.S. and in their native countries were not available unless the applicant was proficient in oral English (Paul, 2000).

Students participated in six 55-minute classes daily, taught by five different instructors. The daily schedule

provided for a change of classes and teachers for four of these periods, and a two-hour afternoon block with a single teacher. Classes were self-contained.

The curriculum in the ESOL Program covered the four proficiency areas of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, and was based on the Florida State Sunshine Standards. Since the ESOL student population at AHS was an adult one, teachers tried to accommodate student requests for specific material they would like to learn. The students were motivated and eager to learn, and they had well-defined personal linguistic goals.

The basic text series used throughout all levels was Expressways (1996). Student placement and promotion were based on the tests accompanying this series. In the advanced levels, other texts supplemented the Expressways texts: Vocabulary Connections (1997), and Challenger (1985).

The state-mandated ESOL Academic Skills Literacy Completion (LCP) Checklist (Appendix A) listed basic competencies which students at this level were expected to complete. An additional emphasis in advanced ESOL classes at AHS was on general instruction in American culture, history, and customs, although this instruction was not intended as a complete preparation for attaining U.S. citizenship. Basic employability skills were also covered.

This practicum project took place on the main campus

of the adult high school, and dealt specifically with advanced, adult ESOL students in day classes. These students were primarily interested in English as a tool for advancement in their chosen careers or professions, whether they remained in the U.S. or returned to their native countries. They had mastered basic survival skills and had attained some proficiency in speaking and listening, but they still had difficulty expressing themselves verbally according to the demands of American society and culture.

The author of this practicum was a full-time teacher of day classes at AHS, with Florida State Certification in English and an endorsement in ESOL, and had been teaching ESOL students for four years. The author's teaching assignment during the project was with Credit Program English classes for American students in the morning, and the two-hour afternoon schedule block with advanced (Level 5F) ESOL students. For this project, resources and personnel throughout the adult high school were utilized.

Problem Statement

Advanced, adult ESOL students' speaking and listening test scores were one to two proficiency levels below their reading and writing test scores, as documented by Expressways

placement and exit tests. In addition, students perceived themselves as having low confidence in their own oral communications skills, as revealed by student surveys/questionnaires and structured interviews.

The Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) was required of all advanced ESOL students before entering the program. To enter the advanced (5F) level, a student's score had to be at least a grade equivalent of 6.6. The TABE did not measure speaking or listening skills. Students were placed in proficiency levels according to scores on the Expressways Placement Test (EPT) (Appendix B). The EPT consisted of two parts: written (reading and writing) and oral (speaking and listening). To enter the advanced level, a student's score on each part of the EPT had to be at least 43, or be a combined score for both parts of at least 85. The EPT was also administered as an exit test to measure progress.

The Director of the ESOL Program at AHS stated that during the school year 1998-1999, as well as during the first semester of the school year 1999-2000, overall initial placement scores on the 5F written section of the EPT averaged 45 points, but oral scores averaged only 40 points. Exit scores for these same periods averaged 50 points on the written test, but only 43 on the oral test. In general, speaking and listening test scores consistently fell one to two grade levels below reading and writing test scores. Ideally, oral

scores should have been commensurate with written scores (S. Paul, personal communication, January 18, 2000).

A teacher-made Student Confidence and Usage Survey (Appendix C) was given to the target group of ten advanced, adult ESOL students in January, 2000, and elicited written responses using a Likert scale of 1-5. The surveys were followed by structured individual interviews (Appendix D) to expand and elaborate on the information gathered in the surveys. The purpose of the surveys and interviews was to investigate when, where, and how often students used English in and out of school, as well as to discover students' confidence in and comfort level with their own speaking and listening skills.

The highest possible score on the survey was 40. Of the ten students who took the survey, four students scored 22, two students scored 24, three students scored 25, and one student scored 28 (Appendix E). These scores indicated that students' use of English outside of the ESOL classroom was limited and that a lack of self-confidence in their oral communication skills could be a factor.

In the structured interviews which followed the surveys, all students were asked the same questions. Although there was no formal scoring system for the student interviews, answers were consistent with the information given in the surveys and in general indicated that students were concerned

about their perceived lack of proficiency in oral communication outside of school and had low confidence in themselves when speaking/listening to native English speakers outside of the protected classroom environment. All ten students cited at least one incident where they had been subjected to rude or impatient responses from native English speakers, which further undermined the students' confidence and willingness to take communicative risks with strangers. However, all ten students indicated an eagerness to improve their oral communication skills in all situations, both in and out of school, and all ten stated that they recognized the need for improved self-confidence and willingness to take risks in order to attain greater linguistic proficiency.

Limited proficiency and confidence in oral communication could have affected students' levels of satisfaction in social and business interaction. Although many of the advanced ESOL students were highly educated, even professionals, in their own countries, many were forced to take minimum-wage jobs here in the United States - in retail, construction, or agriculture - because of their linguistic deficiencies, or because they were not familiar with American job performance techniques and skills in oral communication. The principal of AHS stated that there was a definite need to develop oral skills in the foreign-born/LEP students to increase their chances of securing employment commensurate with the level of their skills and

training, as well as to improve their quality of life here. While students had basic language skills, these were not always transferring to U.S. standards because of lack of practical experience with U.S. cultural practices (R. Ciemniecki, personal communication, January 19, 2000).

As required by the state, general employability skills were part of the overall ESOL curriculum, but at AHS at the time of this project, the focus was on unskilled, minimum-wage jobs in service, agriculture, and retail industries. Many of these jobs required only minimal language and employ-ability skills. The Director of the Migrant Program at AHS stated that many employers of these workers expected that foreign-born workers would have limited English proficiency, so made provision for this in the workplace. Employment applications were printed bilingually, and interviews and pre-employment paperwork were often done in the prospective employee's own language, especially if that language was Spanish or Haitian (E. Gamboa, personal communication, January 20, 2000).

These employer practices worked well for the lower-level LEP students who intended to remain in these types of jobs. However, Paul stated that the needs of up to 35% of the ESOL student population were not being met because of this focus on lower-level jobs. Those more advanced students who were interested in careers or professions, as opposed to jobs,

were not receiving all of the oral communication experiences necessary to meet their goals (S. Paul, personal communication, January 18, 2000).

Gamboa further stated that for advanced students, oral communication was necessary on both social and business levels. Oral skills in business involved business vocabulary, acceptable behaviors in the workplace, formal and informal business language, and the giving and receiving of information to colleagues, superiors, and the public. Social communication included being able to ask informational questions about living problems, customs, acceptable behavior in social situations, and being able to participate in recreational activities, including movies and television (E. Gamboa, personal communication, January 20, 2000).

At AHS, oral communication teaching and learning took place in structured, self-contained classrooms using conversational models derived from textbook situations. While these models dealt with real-life situations, such as visits to the grocery store or doctor's office, and while vocabulary and idioms were related to a wide variety of everyday activities, the fact remained that the structure of the classroom was separate from real life. Oral communication activities took place in a protected environment with a sympathetic teacher. They were excellent simulations, but they were not the real thing. There was a gap between "school" and "real life".

There were no opportunities provided for practicing oral skills outside the classroom, except for those created by the students themselves. However, the students were not confident enough of their own abilities to take the risks necessary to expand their linguistic practice outside of the protected school environment in order to achieve greater linguistic proficiency, as evidenced by the Student Confidence and Usage Survey.

The problem, then, was two-fold. First, the proficiency levels of speaking and listening were consistently one to two levels below reading and writing skills. Second, the students' levels of self-confidence in using oral communication skills outside of the classroom setting were too low to allow them to actively seek opportunities to practice these skills in ways that would contribute to their linguistic growth.

The Expressways entry and exit test scores, student surveys and interviews, and personal communications with administrators showed that an innovative approach was needed to aid students in increasing proficiency in speaking and listening skills, as well as increasing students' self-confidence in their own linguistic abilities, so they could communicate comfortably and effectively in business and social situations in the real world outside of school. Factors influencing the problem were students' lack of opportunity for practical experience in oral communication in a real-life

setting, the structure of the typical self-contained classroom as a simulation rather than an actual real-life experience, and students' limited oral communication experience prior to entering AHS.

The Target Group

The target group for this practicum project consisted of ten advanced, adult ESOL students: two men and eight women. Their ages ranged from 18 to 65 years. There were five different languages spoken by members of the group: Russian, Czechoslovakian, Portuguese, Spanish, and French. Eight countries were represented: Ukraine, Czech Republic, Brazil, Mexico, Uruguay, Argentina, Colombia, and Haiti.

Nine of the ten students had the U.S. equivalent of a high school diploma. Six students had a Bachelor's degree, two had a Master's degree, and there was one medical doctor. All of the students had studied English to some extent prior to coming to the U.S.

All of the students were highly motivated, eager to learn, and had well-defined personal and linguistic goals. Six of the students intended to remain in the U.S. to pursue their chosen careers, while the other four planned to return to their native countries.

Outcome Objectives

The problem addressed in this project was the discrepancy between the average speaking and listening exit test score of 43, and the average written exit test score of 50 for advanced, adult ESOL students in the target group, as measured by the Expressways Placement Test. Ideally, speaking and listening scores should be commensurate with written scores.

In addition, the average pretest score on the Student Confidence and Usage Survey was only 23.9 points out of a possible 40 points.

The specific outcome objectives were:

Objective 1: After 12 weeks of participating in a special program, students in the target group will increase their speaking exit test score over the current average of 43 by at least two points, to a minimum total average of 45 points, as measured by the Expressways Placement Test.

Objective 2: After 12 weeks of participating in a special program, students in the target group will increase their listening exit test score over the current average of 43 by at least two points, to a minimum total average of 45 points, as measured by the Expressways Placement Test.

Objective 3: After 12 weeks of participating in a special program, students in the target group will increase their current average confidence scores of 23.9 by at least five points, to a minimum of 28.9, as measured by the Student Confidence and Usage Survey.

Objective 4: At the end of 12 weeks, all of a group of eight randomly-selected ESOL teachers will rate the Teacher's Manual for an ESOL Volunteer Program with a score of four (good) or five (superior), as measured on a Likert scale.

CHAPTER 2

Research and Planned Solution Strategy

Historically, the proliferation of English around the world began with the pioneering voyages to the Americas and to Asia in the last decades of the 16th century, continued with the colonial expansions in the 19th century, and became firmly entrenched with the adoption of English as an official language by many newly-independent states in the 20th century. English is now the dominant or official language in over 60 countries, and is represented in every continent. It is this spread of representation which makes the term "world language" a reality.

Today, adult students come to the United States to learn or to improve their English because their countries' governments, legal institutions, educational institutions, and even religious institutions carry out their proceedings in English. In addition, the U.S.' dominant economic position acts as a magnet for international business and trade, and organizations wishing to participate in international markets are under considerable pressure to work with English.

English serves as the international language of air traffic control, and in international maritime, policing, and emergency services. It is the chief language of international business and academic conferences, and the leading

language of international tourism. On the lighter side, English is the main language of popular music, and permeates popular culture and its associated advertising. It is also the main language of satellite broadcasting, home computers, and video games (Crystal, 1995).

There is an increasing need in the business community world-wide to find skilled workers who are not only technologically proficient in their fields, but capable of group cooperation and communication in order to solve problems in the workplace. Computers, teamwork, product quality, and customer service are all more important than they were 20 years ago. A global economy necessitates a common language through which both national and international business can be conducted. Hence, the ever-increasing use of English as the international business language (Jacoby & Goldschmidt, 1998).

English is increasingly being used as a tool for interaction of all kinds among nonnative speakers. Well over half of the one billion English speakers of today's world learned English as a second language (Brown,1994b). ESOL students at the adult high school (AHS) who intended to return to their native countries to pursue their planned career goals unanimously reported that proficiency in English was essential for advancement in their chosen fields, and were eager to obtain all of the real-world, practical experience

they could during their stay in the U.S. Those students who planned to remain in the U.S. also recognized the need for English proficiency if they were ever to advance in occupations other than minimum-wage jobs.

To be an adult, linguistically, necessitates acquiring a staggering number of communication skills. To be truly proficient in English, students must know the 20 or so vowels and 24 or so consonants of a spoken dialect, and over 300 ways of combining these sounds into sequences. The working vocabulary of English can reach 50,000 or more active words, with a passive ability to understand about 25,000 more. In addition, there are at least a thousand aspects of grammatical construction governing sentence and word formation, several hundred ways of using pitch, loudness, speed, and rhythm, as well as tone of voice, to convey meaning, and a large number of rules governing the ways in which sentences can be combined into spoken discourse, both in monologue and dialogue. There are also an uncertain, but very large, number of conventions governing the ways in which varieties of the language differ, so that the linguistic consequences of region, gender, class, occupation, and other such factors can be assimilated. Finally, there are the large number of strategies governing the ways in which all of these rules can be bent or broken in order to achieve special effects, such as in jokes or poems. This is, in itself, an overwhelming amount of knowledge, but it

does not even include the task of learning to read and write (Crystal, 1995).

It is a historical fact, rather than a value judgment, that "the competitive nature of American society rewards cultural homogeneity" (Baugh, 1993, p.206). In other words, those individuals who wish to rise in their professions or careers must conform to standard oral communication standards or risk being judged negatively by others who are in a relative position of social power, regardless of how highly educated those individuals might be. A foreign accent or nonstandard dialect can reinforce social borders. It is largely for this reason, and the social isolation that has existed among various groups in America, that long-standing stereotypes are perpetuated (Baugh, 1993). Advanced ESOL students who wished to advance in the workplace realized that they needed to overcome linguistic deficiencies in usage and pronunciation.

One factor influencing pronunciation and usage difficulties of students is the fact that although many of them studied English prior to coming to the U.S., they were taught by nonnative English speakers. Actually, most English language teachers across the globe are nonnative English speakers. The oral communication standards of these teachers in grammatical structure and pronunciation are often different from those of the native English language teacher (Brown, 1994b). Teachers who are not native English speakers have misgivings

about their linguistic competence, and this often results in limited emphasis on, or even erroneous modeling of, oral components of language (Finocchiaro, 1989). Because of this, extensive and reinforcing practice of English speaking and listening skills, in or out of the classroom, in a non-English-speaking country is difficult, if not impossible.

Language is inextricably bound up in virtually every aspect of human behavior. It cannot be separated from the whole person that lives and breathes, thinks and feels. It is a phase of human activity which must not be treated as structurally divorced from the structure of nonverbal human activity. The activity of mankind constitutes a structural whole in such a way that it cannot be subdivided into neat compartments, with language in a behavioral compartment insulated in character, content, and organization from other behavior. That is, the degree of linguistic proficiency directly affects the well-being of the whole person (Brown, 1994a).

When individuals from other cultures enter another, contrasting culture, the shock of this encounter can profoundly affect the performance of these individuals, both as students and as employees. Okoli defined culture as "the total accumulation of an identifiable group's beliefs, norms, activities, institutions, and communication patterns" (Okoli, 1994, p.2). In view of this definition, it is evident that the acculturation

process for a nonnative English speaker depends heavily on facility in oral communication. A negative or hostile environment can affect the individual's ability to communicate effectively, and this failure to communicate may lead to entropy within the individual. Okoli stated that experiences of foreign students on American campuses usually fall into two categories. First, "active-player" types seem to readily immerse themselves into existing cultural networks and use these to tap into basic assumptions, norms, and sense-making mechanisms of the new environment. Okoli also said that, all other things being equal, most of those who emigrate are active-players in the host environment (Okoli, 1994). There are a few emigrants, however, who fall into the category of "isolation", who are so overwhelmed by the cultural clash that they retreat into themselves and may never become acclimated to the new environment or become proficient in English to the degree necessary for success. Okoli concluded that, ultimately, it is the individual involved in the transition who makes the decision as to which of the two cultures wins (Okoli, 1994). It would seem that a gradual, or transitional, period of educational experiences, particularly before entering the work force, would ease the cultural shock, especially for the isolationists, and enable students to become acculturated more successfully.

Learning a second language necessitates the making of

mistakes. Hypotheses about language are tested by the learner through trial and error, and progress is made only by learning from those mistakes. Unfortunately, mistakes are often viewed as threats to one's ego, both internally and externally. Internally, one's critical self and one's performing self can be in conflict: learners perform something "wrong" and become critical of their own mistakes. Externally, learners perceive others exercising their critical selves and judging the blunders of the new learners, often in hurtful ways. So the defenses of new learners rise ever higher. These defenses inhibit learning, which involves self-exposure to a degree manifested in few other endeavors. Brown suggested that risk-taking is an important factor in language learning, particularly in oral communication. Learners have to be able to gamble a bit, to be willing to try out the language and take the risk of being wrong (Brown, 1994a). Since self-esteem is closely connected to the risk-taking factor, students need to know that they are valued in spite of their mistakes.

If students do not feel psychologically and emotionally safe in the learning environment, they do not progress in learning. This kind of safety often comes by building community within the group, whether in the self-contained classroom or in an expanded school setting. Students who fear ridicule or are uncertain of their capabilities will not take the risks necessary for learning, but once trust and confidence

has been established, students blossom (Tchudi & Mitchell, 1999). Successful learning environments are safe from insult and diminishment, places where students and teachers feel they have a common purpose and have come to know and trust each other.

Not only does anxiety have a negative effect on language learning in general, it specifically affects listening comprehension. The type of communication also affects the amount of anxiety listeners experience, and face-to-face communication appears to trigger greater apprehension than more impersonal communication, such as television viewing. Successful students rate self-confidence as one of the factors important to their listening success. However, it could also be said that success leads to self-confidence, so obviously the two are inextricably connected (Carrier, 1999).

Brown stated that the concept of inhibition is often subsumed under the notion of self-confidence and can have a profound effect on language learning. Beginning in childhood and continuing throughout life, all human beings build sets of defenses to protect the ego, but those with weak self-esteem maintain walls of inhibition to protect what is perceived as a lack of self-confidence in a situation or task. So the defenses which students place between themselves and others, particularly those others who are native speakers of the target language, are important factors contributing to second language

success. It is necessary to create contexts for meaningful classroom communication such that the interpersonal ego barriers are lowered to pave the way for free, unfettered communication (Brown, 1994a). During informal classroom discussions, adult ESOL students frequently reported their reluctance to practice their newly-acquired oral communication skills outside of the protected classroom environment for fear of ridicule or downright hostility from native English speakers, a situation which most of the students had experienced more than once.

Stress, which is often related to a lack of self-confidence in oral communication ability, is an important factor in success or failure in employment of nonnative English speakers, and can be due to adjustment and acculturation issues as immigrants attempt to adapt to American culture. A study utilizing a modified refugee acculturative stress inventory showed that most newly arrived refugees experience acculturative stress primarily in areas of spoken English, employment, and limited formal education. Interestingly, gender and race had no measurable impact on acculturative stress. The conclusion of the study was that there is a significant correlation between effective spoken English and employment on the level of stress (Nwandiora & McAdoo, 1996). The authors auggested that for these groups of nonnative English speakers, a transitional period in a semi-protected environment, such as that provided

by a mentor system, between the structured classroom and the work world, could significantly reduce stress levels for these individuals (Nwadiora & McAdoo, 1996).

Another study by Yang involved Chinese students in their first semester at an American university, and revealed that students' real problems with English lay in listening and speaking rather than with reading. These inadequate skills made students diffident in communicating with native English speakers. Students stated that the integration of speaking and listening with reading and writing skills was particulary conducive to developing learners' overall competence in English, not only in everyday settings, but also in academic and professional settings (Yang, 1999).

In addition to the psycholinguistic dimension of listening, the sociolinguistic aspect is also important. The social relationship has an effect on language behavior, on conversational interaction, and on listening comprehension. It is especially important to language learners living in the target language environment, from everyday survival to understanding teachers' lectures and assignments. Real-life listening does not occur in a vacuum, but in a rich social context. The effect of social relationships on language behavior include phonological variation that depends on the listener's ethnicity, phonological variation that depends on perceived social and economic status of people in their workplaces, and morphophonetic

variation that depends on the speaker's perceived social status relative to others in the workplace. Also, the influence of one's perception of self in relation to others in a social interaction can affect word choice (Carrier, 1999). Because English language learners, by their own admission, often feel a lack of confidence in their speaking and listening abilities when interacting with native English speakers, especially strangers, this often results in stilted attempts at, or even avoidance of, conversation for fear of rejection or ridicule. Moreover, not all language learners are equally proficient in the different types of listening, as in the student who does well listening to the teacher's lecture in the language classroom, but fails to comprehend native speakers of the target language outside the classroom (Carrier, 1999).

Since language develops in social interaction, when students work in pairs or groups, they use more language, take greater risks, and help each other learn more. Students will do much more talking when they can share what they know. As students are encouraged to use their background knowledge to express their opinions and to ask questions, and to work with others to discover answers, students gain confidence in themselves as both thinkers and learners. That is, students become actively involved in their own learning as well as building self-confidence in their own abilities (Freeman, 1993). This idea, of course, is the basis for cooperative

learning which, though customarily practiced within the self-contained classroom could be expanded to situations outside the regular classroom as well.

Underlying any communications act, or surface utterance, is a wealth of linguistic and other activity. Through perception and thinking, and sub-vocal languaging, people structure a view of reality and a view of themselves. When it comes to generating language, they formulate that experience, sometimes solely for their own scrutiny, as in talking to oneself, and sometimes for others to respond to. Each "consumer" of language has a structure of words and experience in his or her mind, so communication is never simple. Rather, it is a complex psychic act for both communicator and communicatee. The fit between the two is often rough and ragged: "What I think I say and what you think I said are seldom a perfect match" (Tchudi & Mitchell, 1999, p. 45). This kind of communicative experience is learned best through actual practice over a period of time.

Today, employers are becoming more vocal in what they want or expect the schools to foster in the future workforce. Numerous reports indicate that schools are not turning out students with the kinds of interpersonal skills that employers increasingly need and are willing to pay higher wages for. This could be because the schools are out of touch with the labor market or because these skills cannot be taught in a

formal educational setting (Jacoby & Goldschmidt, 1998). The implication is that experience in the real world may be the surest way to develop many aspects of linguistic proficiency.

A study by the Office for the Study of Automotive Transportation (OSAT) conducted interviews with suppliers on their future education and skills requirements for employees. Respondents divided these requirements into four categories: employability skills, traditional academic skills, "workplace of the 90's and beyond" skills, and manufacturing knowledge. Employability skills were viewed as a building block for the other three types. If applicants had the first three skill sets, they could easily be trained to become modern production workers. All of those interviewed held the belief that in the forthcoming global economy, these skills were of universal importance. The interviewees also agreed that these skills are lacking in the current applicant pool in the U.S. The report further says that respondents placed great emphasis on basic academic skills and thinking skills, as well as communication skills. Employees must be able to work in diverse, self-guided teams. "The current education system does not adequately prepare students with the verbal communication skills required by industry." (OSAT, 1996, p.15)

Adult education has traditionally emphasized teaching the three academic basics of reading, writing, and mathematics,

with the intent of assisting students to pass tests such as the TABE or even the GED test. The correlation between these tests and eventual skills needed to succeed at work, especially in this decade, was negligible. The process of passing those tests did not particularly motivate students, possibly because they also realized the lack of relationship between the tests and a job. Sometimes the process included some job search skills or even some vocational training around a specific job or task. However, interactive group and communication skills were omitted. Many of these students were not successful in the work world, as they moved from job to job, and sometimes to welfare as a last resort. It was clear why these workers were not successful. Tetreault (1997) stated that it was not the workers who failed, but the curriculum that supposedly prepared them for the "real world" did not prepare them for the daily interactive communication, planning, and social skills necessary to fit in long-term in these jobs. Today, labor and industry are calling for personal responsibility, problem solving, communication skills, and teamwork. Many potential workers on all levels lack the social skills of negotiation, giving and taking criticism, and using listening communication skills. Tetreault said that it is essential to create a curriculum that addresses the real needs of business and industry through a "real" work application of necessary skills, using projects that involve planning, negotiation, teamwork, follow-through, and attention

to detail. Tetreault also suggested that teachers and/or mentors become facilitators and guides, just as supervisors and administrators are at work (Tetreault, 1997).

Whitson (1998) has said that "key skills", formerly called "core skills", should be emphasized in the secondary curriculum. These are supposed to bridge the academic-vocational divide, provide vocational relevance, and cultivate the sort of people employers want to employ. It is necessary, however, to think through the concepts supporting key skills, particularly in the case of transferability, to be sure that these skills are indeed applicable in other situations and contexts. The real issue is learning to use what is known, and unlearning what is getting in the way of dealing with a new problem or situation. Employers don't want theories; they want people who can manage and achieve results through other people. Education is about personal growth and development, about life as well as work. Whitson said that education should develop confidence as well as competence, breadth of interests and intellectual curiosity as well as skills. It should encourage people to work together. Whitson also questioned whether employer complaints about skill shortages can be taken at face value, or if what is really meant is that there is a shortage of potential employees perceived as possessing the required behavioral characteristics (Whitson, 1998).

Since a major focus in secondary and post-secondary schools today is on the development of adequate employability skills for all students, adult ESOL students must also be prepared to take advantage not only of opportunities in low-level, minimum-wage jobs, but be provided with the linguistic tools necessary for advancement. It is evident that proficiency in speaking and listening skills is essential not only for preparation for employment, but also in enhancing social communication in all aspects of life. As O'Keefe stated, talk is of vital importance in the learning process throughout life. Ignoring oral language, or equating the spoken word to the written one, shortchanges a key developmental process. Yet most classrooms currently depend on teacher-centered expository communication instead of student-centered shared communication. There is a connection between students' improvement in writing and thinking when they become more proficient listeners and speakers. Speech creates clarity. Talk allows students to begin where they are and grow to what they can be. Most importantly, ideas are expanded through the shared experiences of a community of learners (O'Keefe, 1995).

Each individual is constantly a sender and a receiver of messages. Every interaction creates new and often complex results, responses that in turn stimulate more effects. The words used to encode an idea cannot be directly infused into the listener. The listener hears the message, decodes the

words, interprets body language, and constructs a meaning based on prior experiences and the current situation. "Meaning is in people, not in words." (O'Keefe, 1995, p.3) Language versatility in dealing with diverse situations imbues students with self-confidence and inspires verbal risk-taking. The immediate feedback received from the speaker's audience heightens perceptions and hastens revisions more than does the delayed response received from written communication. O'Keefe also said that listening is more important than speaking if communication is to improve. More than 50% of communication depends on the ability to listen, and is the way to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships, and to identify and and interpret messages. Listening skills determine health, well-being, and success in social and work situations, whether listening for specific data, listening to determine the worth or accuracy of information, or listening to experience the feelings of others. Taking time to build a social climate improves openness and the exchange of ideas, encouraging communicants to take more risks and share thoughts more easily. Building a feeling of cohesion is important for building trust (O'Keefe, 1995). It is important to remember, however, that many of these skills are linguistically and culturally embedded, and that only expanded and prolonged exposure to the target language will build comprehension and proficiency.

Further reference to the importance of listening skills

was stated by Mayher in discussing relevance theory, which is a combination of code and inferential theory. It says that communication is not autonomous, but depends on a variety of inferential processes. In order to attain the most efficient information processing possible, listeners must determine which of the possible implications of an utterance should be inferred. Speakers must choose what they believe will be relevant to listeners based on their understanding of the social and cognitive context of those listeners. Communication is a matter of enlarging mutual cognitive environments, not of duplicating thoughts (Mayher, 1993). Individuals learning to participate in a culture must learn the concepts of that culture and their associated labels. Categories and labels are dynamic systems which derive from active attempts to understand the world, not static lists of cultural ideas, or reading of vocabulary lists. In other words, people actively interpret and label on the basis of their current understanding. Mayher felt that the teacher's task is not to present or transmit the world of knowledge to students, but to help them learn how to do it for themselves. Students can unconsciously internalize forms and functions as long as they have the opportunity to transact with them for real purposes.

Too often, "learning" another language has meant memorizing vocabulary, studying grammar, translating passages, perhaps rehearsing conversational phrases. However, although the

language has been "studied", there is often not much facility in listening to or speaking the language for any authentic purpose outside of class. Such language learning involves "knowing about" a language, but it does not necessarily lead to knowing the language in the same sense as if it were truly acquired. This does not mean that the direct teaching of grammar or vocabulary plays no role at all in the acquisition of a second language, especially for adults, but the research evidence suggests that direct teaching of grammar is not necessary for acquiring the basic structure of the second language (Weaver, 1996). Actual use of the target language in meaningful, authentic situations does far more in the process of attaining proficiency in that language than does static, and boring, memorization.

Weaver also cited immersion as one language learning method, and said that a second language may be most readily acquired in much the same way as one's native language: through immersion in oral and written language - specifically in situations where one needs and wants to communicate in order to understand and be understood. Weaver advocated using immersion in addition to a structured approach to learning grammar, because even when second language learners are taught the grammatical structure and rules of the second language, they may acquire these in a different way or a different order, or not acquire some of them at all (Weaver, 1996).

A currently developing method for second language teaching is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). While the actual practice of this method is diverse in application, some similarities underlie all of its variations. Three particular goals of the method are that communicative competence is the goal at each level of instruction, that interaction between language users and their environment is a primary objective of all exercises, and that the strategies for making sense of something and for negotiating meaning are the center of attention. Just as children learn first languages actively and automatically in natural, informal environments, second language learners go about acquiring language best in similar naturalistic situations in which the meaning and function of language become much more important than the memorization of the forms of the language. Language meanings are not inviolable and self-contained, but rather are created in the very act of students relating to their environment and to each other (Nattinger, 1993).

Closely related to the general subject of language learning methodology is the recurring question of vocabulary study regarding the number of times learners must be exposed to a word before it becomes a part of their lexicon. Cognitive psychologists believe that it is not how many times a student is exposed, but how rich those exposures might be. Coomber and Peet stated that several truly meaningful experiences

with a word will probably accomplish more than drilling on that word ten times. The more involved the learner, the more effective is the learning. This principle applies to three teaching factors associated with effective vocabulary study. One factor is the amount of practice given to the words. A traditional method of teaching vocabulary involves words presented by the teacher, students using the words in sentences, followed by a quiz several days later. This procedure is not effective in increasing students' lexicons. Drilling is also ineffective. What is needed is wide reading of or listening to a variety of material, combined with repetition of key vocabulary as found in context, and reflection on word meanings (Coomber & Peet, 1993).

Effective vocabulary learning involves relationships between words and concepts. Many concepts acquire labels so that members of a speech community can communicate their common experiences to others. These mutually agreed upon labels are words. Word concepts and meanings are not acquired in a single exposure, but with many exposures, thus insuring that the students' knowledge of a word or concept continues to grow. As this knowledge grows, so does the students' knowledge of the world. Vocabulary and concept encounters should result in expanded word meanings, new associations with that word, and, ultimately, how that word is used in various contexts. If "knowing" a word comes from successive

exposures to, and experiences with, that word, then vocabulary teaching must include many opportunities to become familiar with the words in a variety of situations (Coomber & Peet, 1993).

Coomber and Peet also stated that there are two questions to ask when selecting appropriate vocabulary words for teaching. First, what are the students' chances of encountering the word again? Second, how likely are they to need to use the word? Words that denote key concepts and are important beyond the classroom are the words that should be emphasized in vocabulary study. Words are learned best, and used with greatest ease, by relating them to actual situations - the more situations, the better. Active involvement with significant vocabulary in various contexts is what research suggests learners need for building strong language skills. Teachers must find ways to provide that active involvement through many and varied language activities (Coomber & Peet, 1993).

As in vocabulary study, semantics, also, is too often taught in a vacuum. Consequently, students' interest in and analysis of ordinary uses of language rarely extends beyond the classroom. While there may be a focus on grammar or pronunciation or usage in a given unit of study, there is neglect for understanding the meaning in public language. It is essential that students are afforded opportunities

over an extended period of time, both in class and out, to examine language environments which directly affect their lives (McCracken, 1993).

Brown said that ESOL students can successfully use several strategies to improve speaking and listening abilities. These strategies may be grouped into the categories of metacognitive, cognitive, and socioaffective. Metacognitive is a term used in information-processing theory to indicate strategies that involve planning for learning, thinking about the learning process as it is taking place, monitoring of one's production or comprehension, and evaluating learning after an activity is completed. Cognitive strategies are more limited to specific learning tasks and involve more direct manipulation of the learning material itself. Socioaffective strategies have to do with social activity or transacting with others (Brown, 1994a).

Among metacognitive strategies are understanding conditions that help one learn and arranging for the presence of those conditions, correcting one's speech for accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, or appropriateness related to the setting or to the people who are present, and checking the outcomes of one's own language learning against an internal measure of completeness and accuracy. Cognitive strategies include imitating a language model, reordering or reclassifying material to be learned based on common

attributes, consciously applying rules to produce or understand the second language, constructing a meaningful language sequence by combining known elements in a new way, relating new information to visual concepts in memory, and using previously acquired linguistic knowledge to facilitate a new language learning task. Socioaffective strategies for second language learners include cooperation, or working with one or more peers to obtain feedback or model a language activity, and questioning for clarification, or asking a teacher or other native speaker for repetition, paraphrasing, explanation, or examples (Brown, 1994a).

Many instructional practices are appropriate for both fluent English speakers and those who are still developing their English. For all learners, academic development, cognitive development, and language development are interrelated. The most effective programs follow thematic, interdisciplinary instruction, multicultural/global perspectives with lessons connected to past experiences, and collaborative, interactive learning. While effective programs can be constructed in a variety of ways, two-way programs that include both native English speakers and second language speakers have the most long-term benefits (Sturtevant, 1998).

When considering methods for improving speaking and listening skills for adult ESOL learners, it was important to keep in mind what Huggins said about these learners. Adults

must have more influence on the ways in which they learn, as well as what they learn. Adult students are mature, more highly motivated, and more aware of what does and does not work for them in terms of learning styles. If they are treated more as peers than as subordinates, and given credit for all they can bring to the learning process, they will go further (Huggins, 1992). Cheatham, Colvin, and Laminack also recommended remembering that adult students cannot be treated as children, and know better than children what they want from educational encounters, have rich personal experiences on which to build, can be motivated to try different approaches to learning, have unique talents, and have had many successes in life. They simply do not have the strategies and experience in communication that they need and want (Cheatham, Colvin, & Laminack, 1993).

Weaver stated that adult students, in particular, need genuine learning experiences that resemble, if not replicate, the kinds of experiences from which they learn outside of school. Authenticity is important for generating motivation and purpose. Teachers help students learn needed skills and strategies in the context of authentic learning experiences. Another point is that the construction of knowledge, linguistically or otherwise, takes time, and that errors are a necessary concomitant of learning. Acceptance means accepting errors as necessary to growth , and that they can indicate

progress. It means helping learners achieve goals by providing non-judgmental support. Such acceptance helps students feel that they can try new ways of using language without risking negative responses and repercussions. In other words, it enables learners to feel psychologically safe (Weaver, 1996).

Just as there is evidence that assembly-line workers become alienated from their work because it lacks meaning, evidence is emerging which suggests that students also become alienated from school "work" because it lacks meaning. Even some vocational education students fail to find industry-driven curricula meaningful to their everyday lives because these fail to recognize differences within communities and cultures. When students begin working in the real world, they face difficulty in dealing with the diversity and conflict in today's society and places of work. There is also the question of the "hidden curriculum", defined as those unstated norms, values, and beliefs embedded in and transmitted to students through the underlying rules that structure the routines and social relationships in school and classroom life (Gregson, 1996). This hidden curriculum is conveyed through the social interaction between educators or mentors and students. Gregson felt that it is essential that students experience hands-on, real-world situations under the guidance of qualified mentors or instructors in a setting associated with, but apart from, the traditional classroom setting. Curriculum only becomes

meaningful to students when they become members of a learning community supportive of efforts to understand and apply knowledge to the real world (Gregson, 1996).

Much of the literature on language learning indicates that teaching methods utilizing hands-on, real-life learning experiences in which students actively participate in the learning process lead to mastery of the target language. Unfortunately, far too often the oral and written texts of teachers and schools are not chosen with any attention at all to the social and cognitive context of listeners and/or readers, but rather in terms of some organizing principle dictated by the subject or discipline. Reciprocal use of the learner's own experiences or prior knowledge is often denied them in school, and students are often urged simply to act as tape recorders, memorizing and repeating information given (Mayher, 1993).

By far the greatest part of language usage involves oral English, either receptive or productive. Despite this pervasiveness, oral language has seldom been given much attention in school. Conversation among class members is arbitrarily cut off when class begins, and further oral communication during class time is usually limited to questions and responses between student and teacher. Language is used for a wide variety of reasons in conversation - to establish self-esteem, to make initial contact with others, to assess feelings,

to form relationships, to seek information - in essence, to structure the world and to compare it to the world of others. One of the major ways in which students will become good conversationalists is for schools to allow them to talk about matters of more than a trivial nature. Students should feel free to discuss personal and academic problems, people, projects, hopes and goals, and world problems. When acknowledged as important, conversation will become the foundation for the entire spoken language program. Without students who are secure and competent conversationalists, other language activities will be static or ineffectual. People talk to assimilate new knowledge, make sense of it, and integrate it into old knowledge (Tchudi and Mitchell, 1999).

In determining communicative competence, it is necessary to consider the particularities of the school setting, where both required tasks and style of communication differ significantly from other daily experiences and communication. Communication can be described as on a continuum from context-embedded to context-reduced. Context-embedded communication uses nearby environmental clues, whereas context-reduced communication does not. Most classroom communication is context-reduced. Even though many traditional ESOL classroom activities are hands-on, using objects and illustrations, they are still often several steps removed from real-life experience (Lessow-Hurley, 1996).

Lessow-Hurley described language proficiency as being of two types: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), and Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). BICS is the language skills required for face-to-face communication, where interactions are context-embedded. That is, listeners and speakers can see each other's gestures, facial expressions, and body language, all of which give clues to the meaning of the speaker. CALP is the language skills required for academic achievement in a context-reduced environment. Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students can more quickly acquire BICS in English from their associates, from the media, and from daily experiences than they can acquire CALP, which is required in the classroom. Failure to recognize the difference in these skill groups may result in erroneously assuming that students have acquired sufficient proficiency in English to succeed in reaching their educational goals in all situations where English is used, when in reality they have not (Lessow-Hurley, 1996).

Weaver described the constructivist approach to teaching, which assumes that learners construct knowledge themselves from comprehensible input, as opposed to the behavioralist notion that learning consists of habit formation. In constructivist classrooms, teachers help learners do things they can't already do, and in this process the students learn how to do them independently. Communication skills are taught

within the context of their use, aiming for fluency first, then clarity, and finally correctness (Weaver, 1996).

Andrews stated that there are at least three long-term goals that have major applications in the area of language proficiency. First is spontaneity, which refers to the ability to speak freely and with confidence so that the speaker can allocate more attention to what is being said, the message or communication to be shared. The spontaneous user of language engages comfortably and confidently in social conversation. Reluctant language users do not use language freely, are embarrassed and self-conscious, demonstrating, both verbally and nonverbally, uncertainties about themselves and their abilities. The second goal is precision, which describes the quality of exactness. Students demonstrate the ability to utilize a more expanded repertoire of words to express more exact meaning. The third goal is elaboration and refers to the ability to use more complex language structures to provide support, clarification, and greater specificity into the communication. Before language users can attain these goals, they must first be aware of the roles language plays in daily life. Authentic experience provides the vehicle for this (Andrews, 1998).

Few learners actually study the English language and how it varies according to its use and according to who is using it for changing purposes as situations change. Students need

opportunities to observe the distinctions in language among regional and social variations with their numerous pronunciations and meanings, as well as to experience a variety of social discourse conventions. As students become more adept with language and can use language more spontaneously and with increasing levels of elaboration and precision, then thoughts and ideas of more complex natures can be formed, synthesized, articulated, and evaluated. As students grow in language, they also grow through language. Learning to communicate is more than acquiring a set of linguistic resources. It is also discovering how to use them in conversation with a variety of people and for a variety of purposes. Language and the social surroundings in which it is used are virtually inseparable. Another point Andrews made is that language use shifts to fit a particular circumstance. "Correct" language use is determined by its context. As contexts change, so do the standards and criteria for judging correctness. There are options for correctness within the sociolinguistic system, as ultimately determined by the application of multiple criteria. Only practice in authentic situations can make this apparent to the nonnative English speaker. "We talk like the people we routinely talk with." (Andrews, 1998, p.11).

Brown stated that if communicative competence is the goal of a language classroom, then instruction needs to incorporate all of its components: organizational, pragmatic,

strategic, and psychomotor. Communicative goals are best achieved by giving due attention to language use and not just usage, to fluency and not just accuracy, to authentic language and contexts, and to students' eventual need to apply classroom learning to heretofore unrehearsed contexts in the real world (Brown, 1994b). He also admonished teachers to try to keep every technique used as authentic as possible, to use language that students will actually encounter in the real world. In other words, students must be prepared to be independent learners and manipulators of language when school is no longer part of their daily lives.

Finocchiaro named several characteristics of a well-designed curriculum for ESOL students. It should use the students and their backgrounds as the point of departure for teaching any aspect of communication skills. It should reflect realistic objectives and consider students' needs for achievement of their own goals. A primary objective in today's programs is to develop communicative competence in learners; that is, to help them understand and produce language which is not only correct but also appropriate for the varied functions which language serves in real-life situations (Finocchiaro, 1989).

Regarding the consideration of real-life situations in language teaching, Nattinger said that one aspect of oral communication in real life is the occurence of situations

in which the participants must redirect their communication in response to newly introduced facts and events. This requires not only sudden changes of expression and context, but also draws on both receptive and productive skills. He suggested creating open-ended scenarios utilizing roleplaying, wherein students are presented with a situation, such as asking for a dinner date, and who then invent and expand on a dialogue to fit the situation. Rather than first learning correct structures, then learning how to apply them in discourse, it is more likely that the learner learns how to do conversation, how to interact verbally, and out of this interaction syntactic structures are developed (Nattinger, 1993). Situational conversation is excellent practice, of course, but the fact remains that the situations are contrived and take place in a controlled setting with students who may not feel personal relevance in the activity.

Exemplary programs that prepare students for real-world jobs or careers avoid a separation between theory and practice at all levels of communication instruction, smoothing the direct transfer of skills from the classroom to professional performance. These programs are characterized by curriculum and teaching strategies that include problems and simulated situations which call for use of basic skills that are used outside the academic setting as well as opportunities for complex thinking and problem solving. Workers of the 21st

century, regardless of country of origin, must understand the economic, political, social, and cultural dimensions of the society in which they will be working - a clear distinction between job training and education (Badway, 1998). Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin echoed Badway on strategies for meeting LEP students' needs. Collaborative efforts between students and students/teachers/mentors can help turn frustration with language learning into success. The authors stressed the need for hands-on opportunities for interaction with others as well as using a multimodal approach to learning (Brice & Roseberry-McKibbin, 1999).

Cross-cultural awareness is developed when an individual is enabled to interact with someone of a different culture, race, or ethnic background with authenticity, respect, openness, and acceptance. These personal experiences offer intense, powerful opportunities for self-discovery and reflection, leading to new insights about values, attitudes and beliefs. When students', or mentors', perspectives are broadened, changed, or expanded through different experiences, then the criteria for making value judgments may also change. Much of what is learned involves making new interpretations that enable further elaboration (Hansman, Grant, Jackson, & Spencer, 1999).

In a teacher training manual for prospective ESOL teachers, Short stated that teachers should become facilitators and let

students assume more responsibility for their learning. Real-world, authentic activities should be planned to actively involve students in processing and acquiring language, thereby holding student interest and engendering motivation. It is also important to provide support for LEP students, even after they have gained considerable proficiency. Students will inevitably confront unfamiliar situations and linguistic dilemmas for which they need additional resources geared to their individual proficiency levels. A tutorial or mentor system, in addition to the classroom teacher's availability, can be invaluable (Short,1991).

Opportunities for second language learning students to employ their emerging language skills should be chosen with care and involve mentors who are sympathetic to these learners' efforts. Desirable mentor qualities for working with adult students include a respect for students as individuals, an attitude of both mentors and students learning from each other, a sensitivity to adults' needs for immediate relevance, and an understanding of the integration of language components. The Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc., stresses learner-centered instruction and use of real-world materials in promoting literacy for adults, especially for adult ESOL students. For many of these students, the immediate need is for practical lessons that will satisfy their personal goals. Also, most adults seem to learn better in informal settings. It is

essential to encourage students to talk, which also involves quiet, sympathetic listening by the mentor in order to discover the interests and concerns of the students. Asking leading questions, but avoiding pressure on students for "correct" answers, and giving signs of thoughtful reflection on what students say are important ingredients of cooperative communication (Cheatham, Colvin, & Laminack, 1993).

Planned Solution Strategy

From the literature it was evident that the importance of proficiency in oral communication in the work world as well as in building a satisfying personal life was beyond question. Building proficiency required extended practice over time. The literature showed a correlation between the linguistic risk-taking necessary for growth in language learning and the degree of self-confidence students needed to bolster their willingness to take those risks. As Weaver (1996) pointed out, students would only take risks if they felt psychologically safe. Andrews (1998) stated the need to consider the goals of spontaneity, precision, and elaboration in creating meaningful curricula for students, especially adult ones. Brown (1994a,b). Finocchiaro (1989), and Weaver (1996), among others, said that ideal language learning

activities were based on real-world situations, and Okoli (1994), Nwadiora and McAdoo (1996), Carrier (1999), Tetreault (1997), and Sturtevant (1998) pointed out the desirability of a protected or transitional environment in which students, under the guidance of sympathetic teachers and mentors, could expand their linguistic skills beyond the classroom.

The problem was to devise a way to provide opportunities for adult students to receive a maximum amount of practical, real-life experience in oral communication within a protected environment outside of the self-contained classroom. The literature cited many examples of activities in speaking and listening within the self-contained classroom, but almost none which went beyond the confines of the traditional class setting. The exceptions were programs in vocational training which utilized job or career internships, usually in school-to-work situations. Okoli (1994), in particular, favored the gradual transition from classroom to the real world to ease cultural shock for LEP students.

One possible solution was to involve business partners associated with the school as mentors to students willing to volunteer their services in an actual business setting. This, however, was not feasible, due to liability restrictions imposed by the businesses' insurance companies. Instead, the solution chosen for this practicum project was to utilize the available resources of the adult high school and associated

vocational/technical campus itself as the protected, transitional environment between self-contained classroom and outside world. A target group of ten adult, advanced ESOL students would be asked to volunteer to be matched with ten mentors, also volunteers, who were school employees working in various departments throughout the school. These employees were non-instructional staff who carried out the business aspects of the school in such areas as information and reception services, clerical services, financial services, and technological services. Instructional personnel could also volunteer to participate. Students would be matched to actual jobs on campus, according to their background training and skills, as well as their personal preferences. The purpose for the project would be to enable students to expand their opportunities to use their oral communication skills in authentic, real-world settings while maintaining a protected environment. It was believed that this additional real-world practice would improve students' speaking and listening skills while reducing the stress associated with using these skills with total strangers, thus increasing students' self-confidence in their own abilities.

This ESOL Volunteer Program would be mutually beneficial to both students and mentors. Mentors would receive badly needed assistance with routine, time-consuming tasks. Many of the advanced ESOL students were highly educated in their

own countries and possessed knowledge and skills which could be used advantageously in many areas on campus. The students, in turn, would receive meaningful work experience while using speaking and listening in performing their assigned tasks.

In addition to practice in speaking and listening in a work environment, social communication would take place as relationships were built between students and mentors. Another advantage to students was that they would be exposed to a variety of speaking styles. Since this was real-life work experience, students would be able to claim this experience on their resumes upon leaving the program, a consideration of particular value to those students returning to their own countries where associations with American businesses are held in high esteem.

ESOL student volunteers would participate for two hours daily within the scheduled afternoon block, for four days each week, for 12 weeks. On Friday of each week, students would meet in the regular classroom for evaluation and discussion of that week's performance. Mentors' responsibilities would be minimal: to explain the tasks to be accomplished and briefly assist as needed. Tasks requiring oral skills would be particularly emphasized. It was thought probable that in these circumstances social communication and informal conversation between mentors and students would also take place.

During the 12-week implementation period, a Teacher's Manual for an ESOL Volunteer Program would be created so that the project could be easily replicated in other settings.

CHAPTER 3

Method

At the time this project began, there was no provision at the adult high school for advanced, adult ESOL students to use speaking and listening skills outside of the regular classroom. Although these skills were part of the whole-language ESOL curriculum, student practice of these skills was limited to in-class drills and simulations of real-life situations. It was assumed that students would use their speaking and listening skills outside of school, but as students themselves stated, they were reluctant to seek out opportunities for practice due to low self-confidence and fear of rejection by or hostility from native English speakers. The purpose of this practicum project was to provide adult, advanced ESOL students with a transitional experience between classroom and real world, where students could practice speaking and listening in a protected, non-judgmental environment, in order to increase their oral communication proficiency and to bolster confidence in their linguistic skills.

Coley and Scheinberg (1990) devised guidelines for use in the preparation for implementation of educational projects. These guidelines included consideration of four general areas. First, training or education should include the educational

objectives, strategies or techniques to be employed, and the format or schedule. Second, information development and dissemination should show definition of the target group, content of the project as supported by a review of the literature, and method of development. These first two areas, including objectives, proposed strategies and scheduling, as well as a review of the literature and selection of the target group were planned in advance of the actual implementation. The third area concerned counseling or other support services which should be provided for participants for the duration of the project. Finally, there was provision of resources, which for this project meant using mentors in various departments throughout the school campus, as well as the equipment used within those departments (Coley & Scheinberg, 1990). These third and fourth areas were included in the actual implementation over the course of the project.

Pre-Implementation Tasks

Before implementation could begin, it was necessary to accomplish several preparatory tasks. First, endorsement of the project was received from both the director of the vocational/technical school and the principal of the adult high school. This endorsement included permission to conduct

the project campus-wide, using school personnel and facilities, and following the Matrix of Activities (Appendix F).

Second, the TABE, the Expressways Placement Test, and the Student Confidence and Usage Survey were administered to and scored for the ten students in the target group (Appendix E).

Third, a memo was sent to instructional and non-instructional personnel throughout the school, informing them of the impending project, its purpose and objectives, and soliciting responses from individuals who would be interested in participating as mentors. Response to the memo was positive, with 15 potential mentors volunteering to participate, although only ten were needed. It was decided to do an initial matching of students with appropriate mentors, keeping the extra five volunteers in reserve in case changes should become necessary.

Target Group: Individuals Identified

Students in the target group are here described more specifically. Pre-test scores for these students are in Appendix E.

Student one was female, 65 years old, from the Ukraine in Russia. Although Russian was her native language, she also spoke Polish and German, as well as several local Russian dialects. She had been trained in Russia as an educator,

and had taught Russian language arts at a university in Moskow. She and her husband emigrated to the U.S. ten years ago, and were in the process of becoming U.S. citizens. Her knowledge of English grammar, usage, and vocabulary were commensurate with entry requirements for the advanced ESOL level, but in spite of individual, intensive oral work with tutors at AHS, her accent remained extremely pronounced, and native English speakers had difficulty understanding her. Therefore, she was paired with a mentor in the computer lab who already knew the student and her pronunciation problems, and who would adjust tasks to her individual capabilities. Tasks performed were clerical, such as filing and ordering supplies. She also carried verbal messages from the computer personnel to recipients in other locations on campus. On occasion, she assisted lower proficiency level ESOL students with computer programs in grammar and vocabulary. On several occasions she was asked to serve as translator when Russian-speaking-only students came to the main office to register for beginning ESOL classes.

Student two was male, 23 years old, from the Czech Republic. He held a Bachelor's degree in physiology and physical education. In his native country, his job was supervising water safety programs for the government, and he was an experienced lifeguard. He was paired with the only male mentor, the coordinator of the Phoenix Program, which is a dropout

prevention program for at-risk American students. The coordinator felt that this student would be an excellent role model for the American students. Student two's tasks were to work at the reception desk in the Phoenix office, greeting students and visitors and directing them to the appropriate location or person requested, as well as answering questions and making appointments for counselors and staff in the Phoenix Program.

Student three was female, 34 years old, from Brazil. Her native language was Portuguese. She held a Master's degree in education and was an elementary school teacher. For this project, she was paired with the ESOL teacher in the computer lab, and her task was to tutor proficiency levels three and four, using computer programs to teach grammar and vocabulary. She was directed to use English only while tutoring, and was to verbally report student progress to the supervising teacher on a daily basis. She was also to serve as a liason between these students and agencies or other sources of information to find answers to everyday living problems.

Student four was a 28-year-old female from Mexico whose native language was Spanish. Although she held a Bachelor's degree in her native country, in the U.S. she had to work in agriculture, harvesting seasonal crops, because of limited English proficiency. She and her husband were legal aliens

in this country, but both were studying to become U.S. citizens. Her ambition was to improve her English proficiency enough to pass the entrance exams for nursing school. She was paired with the school nurse who works closely with American girls in the Teen-Age Parenting Program (TAPP). Student four's task was to tutor some of these girls in the subject areas of biology and health.

Student five was female, 25 years old, from Brazil. Her native language was Portuguese, although she also spoke some Spanish. She held a Bachelor's degree in business and her goal was to obtain as much American business experience as possible while she was in the U.S., since this would be a great advantage in her career advancement when she returned to Brazil. In addition to going to school at AHS, she had a part-time job in retail sales in the local area. She was paired with a mentor in the school's business and finance office, and her task was to assist the mentor with various kinds of financial records, telephoning for necessary information, answering the phone and taking messages, and assisting as needed in the adjacent general reception area.

Student six was a 24-year-old female from Uruguay whose native language was Spanish. She also spoke Portuguese and some French. She held a Bachelor's degree in public relations, but had had jobs in several other areas of business as well. She had a friendly, outgoing personality, so was paired with

a mentor from the Nail Technology section of the vocational school's cosmetology department. Her task was to greet and converse with patrons from the surrounding community, arrange appointments, answer telephones, and handle patron's payments for services.

Student seven was an 18-year-old male from Haiti whose native language was French. He did not have a high school diploma, but was considering entering the GED program at AHS. His goal was to return to Haiti as a missionary or minister. His mentor was the secretary for the migrant program at AHS, where his duties were greeting applicants for the program and assisting them with their paperwork. He was also called to other locations on campus to serve as a translator as needed.

Student eight was a 27-year-old female from Colombia whose native language was Spanish. She held a degree in molecular biology, but wanted to change her field to business. She had connections with a coffee import company with offices in the U.S., and hoped to be able to stay here to work. Her mentor was the secretary for the guidance department for the vocational/technical programs, and her tasks were to act as receptionist for students seeking guidance services, to make appointments for them, and act as liason between counselors and students. Since this office was in the main administration building, she was often asked to translate for applicants seeking information on ESOL programs.

Student nine was a 31-year-old female from Argentina whose native language was Spanish. She was a neuro-surgeon in Argentina, but married an American and now resided in the U.S. Her goal was to attain enough English proficiency to pass the licensing examinations so she could practice here in the U.S. Her mentor was the school nurse, who worked closely with the pregnant American girls in the Teen-Age Parenting Program. Student nine's tasks were to perform, under supervision, such medical services as blood pressure checks, fetal monitoring, pre-natal health advice to expectant mothers, and any other task permissible by law that would increase her knowledge of medical terminology.

Student ten was a 45-year-old female from Colombia, Spanish-speaking, and with a Bachelor's degree in business. She hoped to be able to remain in the U.S., but if this were to be impossible, her proficiency in English would enable her to advance quickly in business in Colombia. She was formerly an executive secretary to the CEO of a large Colombian publishing company. Her mentor was in the business office and bookkeeping department in the main administration building. Her tasks were to assist with financial record keeping and to communicate with students and faculty regarding various accounts. She also answered telephones, took messages, and gathered information pertaining to financial records.

Implementation: Week One

On Monday and Tuesday of Week One, the 15 potential mentors who responded positively to the memo were interviewed. Important points that were included in the interview were, first, to reassure mentors that this project would not be overly time-consuming to them, but rather a help in performing routine tasks that could be delegated to others. Although it was hoped that some social interaction would take place, most of the oral communication would involve assigning tasks and giving brief instructions about completion of those tasks. Preferred tasks were those utilizing speaking and listening skills. Another point was to explain the purpose of the project: to improve listening and speaking skills of students as well as increasing students' confidence in their own abilities by giving them opportunities outside the classroom for practice with native English speakers in a real-life setting. At the end of the interview, potential mentors were given the Mentor Needs Assessment Checklist (Appendix G), to be completed then or returned to the interviewer by the following day.

Also on Monday and Tuesday, students in the target group were given the Student Skills and Preferences Checklist (Appendix H) to determine their prior education and areas of special training and expertise, as well as their preferences for types of tasks they would like to perform. This checklist

was explained point by point as students completed the form. The checklists from mentors and students were then correlated by matching the needs of mentors with skills of students. The five remaining volunteer mentors who were not paired were asked to remain on "stand-by", in case changes should be necessary. Also on Tuesday, students were shown the use of the Student Daily Activity Checklist (Appendix I). This checklist was to show specific examples, on a daily basis, of the actual use of speaking and listening activities done while working with the mentor. The student checklist also provided space for recording any special communication problems which might occur on the task site, such as misunderstanding instructions or difficulty in performing a task due to lack of linguistic proficiency or knowledge of procedures.

Earlier in the school year, students had written a brief autobiography as a writing assignment. Copies of these were now given back to the students to make additions or corrections. After obtaining each student's permission, these corrected autobiographies were Xeroxed and given to the students' paired mentors, so that these mentors would have some knowledge of their assigned student before the first meeting.

On Wednesday of Week One, students were taken individually to their campus work sites and introduced to their mentors. Immediately following the introduction, students and mentors took a brief period to get acquainted, and mentors outlined

tasks for students to accomplish. By Thursday of Week One, all students and mentors were paired and actual work on tasks begun.

Implementation: Weeks Two to Eleven

Activities for Weeks Two to Eleven followed the same general format each week. Students met with mentors for four days, Monday through Thursday, for two hours each day. On Fridays, the students met with mentors for one hour, then came to the regular classroom for one hour of oral discussion and evaluation of progress, using the Student Daily Activity Checklist (Appendix I) for that week from each student.

As part of ongoing formative evaluation, each student in the target group summarized for the rest of the group the speaking and listening activities accomplished that week. Problems listed on the checklists were shared and solutions found through group discussion. Problems actually were few and usually related to vocabulary or terminology. Positive incidents were also discussed by having students each relate something good, interesting, or funny that happened that week while working with the mentor. New checklists were given to students for the following week.

Formative evaluation was also done through the Daily

Monitoring Checklist (Appendix J). This writer visited all target group students and mentors daily, monitoring activities and progress, and documenting the observations. On Fridays, these observations were correlated with the Student Daily Activities Checklists during oral class discussion, so that any discrepancies or omissions would be covered.

Mentors were not required to keep written checklists, in order to keep paperwork for them to a minimum and help ensure their continued cooperation with the project. However, since mentors signed the Student Daily Activity Sheets at the end of each week, they had an opportunity to see and discuss any problems with students. Also, mentors were briefly questioned orally on a daily basis, using questions on the Daily Monitoring Checklist.

Mentors and students had been told from the start that if at any time during the 12-week implementation period there was a problem with either student or mentor being dissatisfied with tasks required or the performance of these, or if there should be personal considerations that necessitated new student/mentor pairings, there would first be discussion with the student and/or mentor to attempt to resolve the problem. If this discussion failed to resolve the problem, the student would be paired with a new mentor, but the daily monitoring tools would continue uninterrupted with the new pairing. This became necessary only with student four, who was uncomfortable

with her tutoring situation. At the end of Week Two, this student was successfully paired with a new mentor in the hair styling section of the cosmetology department. Student four's duties now were to greet incoming patrons, converse with those patrons until the time of their appointment, make new appointments, and handle patrons' payments.

During Week Six, a midpoint evaluation took place through informal, individual interviews with both students and mentors to elicit responses to three questions. The first question was: Do you think that progress in both speaking and listening is being made? The second question was: Do you feel that student self-confidence with oral communication is increasing? And the third question was: Can you suggest any changes or improvements to the program? Responses of students and mentors were positive and showed satisfaction with the arrangements. Students were encountering a variety of speaking styles from public contacts made in the course of performing their tasks, and were dealing with diversity in pronunciation successfully. The main request for change was to allow more time each day for this project.

Compilation of a Teacher's Manual for an ESOL Volunteer Program was begun during Week Ten and completed during Week Eleven. This manual described the project and included an explanation of purpose and procedures, as well as reproducible

forms. At the end of Week Eleven, copies of this manual were given to eight ESOL teachers at AHS who had been randomly selected by the Director of the ESOL Program. These teachers were asked to read and evaluate the manual, using a rating questionnaire (Appendix M).

Implementation: Week Twelve

During Week Twelve, regular student/mentor activities continued through Wednesday. On Thursday, students returned to the regular classroom where the speaking/listening section of the Expressways Placement Test was administered as a post-test to determine speaking and listening progress. Mentors received the Mentor's Final Evaluation Questionnaire (Appendix K). On Friday, students completed the Student Confidence and Usage Survey as a post-test to determine progress in self-confidence and usage of English outside the classroom (Appendix C). Students also completed the Student Final Evaluation Questionnaire (Appendix L). This was followed by a general group discussion to elicit suggestions for improvements or changes to the project for future use with other student groups.

The Teacher's Manual Rating Questionnaire (Appendix M) was collected from each of the eight randomly-selected ESOL teachers who had been asked to read and evaluate the Teacher's

Manual for an ESOL Volunteer Program. The questionnaires' results were tabulated.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Linguistic proficiency can be defined as having sufficient command of the language for a particular purpose. As the purpose for each individual or group varies, so must the means of evaluation of that proficiency. Therefore, before any valid evaluation can take place, it is necessary to have a well-defined purpose (Hughes, 1995). The specific purpose of this practicum project was defined by the objectives.

Pre-tests were administered prior to implementation to determine both proficiency and confidence levels of the target group students. These pre-tests were the speaking and listening portions of the Expressway Placement Test (EPT) (1996), and the Student Confidence and Usage Survey (Appendix C). The Director of the ESOL Program at AHS had stated that student records for advanced (5F) ESOL students for the past three semesters showed average entrance speaking and listening scores to be 40 points, and exit scores for this same group to be 43 points, as measured by the EPT (S. Paul, personal communication, January 18, 2000). The entrance score averages in speaking and listening for the target group in this project were 40.9 points (Appendix N).

Objective One stated: After 12 weeks of participating

in a special program, students in the target group will increase their speaking exit scores over the current average of 43 by at least two points, to a minimum total average of 45 points, as measured by the Expressways Placement Test.

At the end of 12 weeks, the oral portion of the Expressways Placement Test was administered as a speaking post-test to the target group. The results (Appendix N) showed an average speaking proficiency increase for the group of 4.3 points over the average entrance score of 40.9 points, or a total average exit score of 45.2, an increase of 2.2 points over the former exit average of 43 points. Therefore, Objective One was met.

Objective Two stated: After 12 weeks of participating in a special program, students in the target group will increase their listening exit test scores over the current average of 43 by at least two points, as measured by the Expressways Placement Test.

At the end of 12 weeks, the oral portion of the Expressways Placement Test was administered as a listening post-test to the target group. The results (Appendix N) showed an average listening proficiency increase for the group of 4.3 points over the average entrance score of 40.9 points, or a total average exit score of 45.2, an increase of 2.2 points over the former exit average of 43 points. Therefore, Objective Two was met.

Objective Three stated: After 12 weeks of participating in a special program, students in the target group will increase their current average confidence scores of 23.9 by at least five points, to a minimum of 28.9, as measured by the Student Confidence and Usage Survey.

At the end of 12 weeks, the Student Confidence and Usage Survey was administered as a post-test to the target group. The results (Appendix N) showed an average increase of eight points, for a total group average of 31.9 points. Therefore, Objective Three was met.

Objective Four stated: At the end of 12 weeks, all of a group of eight randomly-selected ESOL teachers will rate the Teacher's Manual for an ESOL Volunteer Program with a score of four (good) or five (superior), as measured on a Likert scale.

During Week Eleven of the implementation, the completed manual (Appendix O) was given to eight ESOL teachers at AHS who had been randomly selected by the Director of the ESOL Program. These teachers were asked to read and evaluate the manual using a Likert scale on a rating questionnaire (Appendix M). At the end of Week Twelve, these questionnaires were collected and the results tallied as follows: five teachers gave the manual an overall rating of five (superior), and three teachers gave the manual an overall rating of four (good). Therefore, Objective Four was met.

Some of the assessments in this project were alternative assessments, defined by Pierce and O'Malley (1992) as any method of finding out what a student knows or can do that is intended to show growth and inform instruction and is not a a standardized test. They are authentic because they are based on activities that reflect real-life settings, they require integration of language skills, and they include teacher observation, performance assessment, and student self-assessment.

Alternative assessment tools used during implementation included the Student Daily Activity Checklist (SDAC) (Appendix I) and the Daily Monitoring Checklist (DMC) (Appendix J). Students in the target group used the SDAC daily to record activities in speaking and listening actually performed while completing tasks with mentors, as well as to note specific problems. Both the SDAC and the DMC were used as the basis for class discussion on Fridays. Problems were few, and generally were related to unfamiliar vocabulary or business terminology. They were easily solved by finding dictionary definitions, or by the teacher or mentor explaining unfamiliar business customs - for example, the concept of time and punctuality, which differs in various cultures.

Positive aspects of the student/mentor relationship were also discussed. After the second week of participation, students reported that, in many cases, social interaction was becoming friendship, and that mentors were extending invitations

to students for cultural, church, and club events outside of school. This was an unplanned bonus of the program which resulted in greater opportunities for language practice outside of school.

In addition to successful completion of the four outcome objectives, there were other positive results from the project. Of the ten students in the target group, five planned to return to their native countries. All five of these students said that they would be able to use this practical experience in the project as part of their resumes, and that this affiliation with American business departments would be of particular value, since in their countries bilingual capabilities, as well as American work experience, were held in high regard. One student specifically said that upon returning to Colombia, there was already guaranteed a substantial job promotion and salary increase, due to participation in the ESOL Volunteer Program. It may also be noted that Student Nine, the doctor from Argentina, was invited to represent AHS as the featured graduation speaker at the end of the school year, an honor the student credited to increased confidence and proficiency gained through participation in the Volunteer program. At the end of the project, all of the participating students received a letter from the adult education office at AHS, certifying participation in the program, which could be used as a letter of recommendation.

Another benefit from the program was stated by the principal at AHS, who said that not only students benefitted from the program, but that others throughout the campus with whom the students were in contact learned to understand the problems that LEP students face and to respect their efforts and diversities (R. Ciemniecki, personal communication, June 8, 2000).

Prior to implementation, it was hoped that the average score on the Mentor's Final Evaluation Questionnaire (Appendix K) would be at least 28 points out of a possible 35. When the results of the questionnaire were tabulated, the average was 33.1 points (Appendix P). It was also hoped that the average score on the Student Final Evaluation Questionnaire (Appendix L) would be at least 35 points out of a possible 45. When the results of the questionnaire were tabulated, the average was 41.1 points (Appendix Q).

CHAPTER 5

Recommendations

A positive response to this project was received from both students and mentors, as evidenced by responses during the final class discussion and the responses to the evaluation questionnaires (Appendixes P,Q). Seventy percent of mentors and 80% of students wrote comments on their evaluations. Eighty percent of these comments requested continuation of the program with an increased time allocation for the next school year. Based on this, and their personal observations, both the principal of AHS and the Director of the ESOL Program are presently considering an extension of the project. Although no final decision has been reached, the outlook is favorable. Possibilities for expansion at AHS include extending the project over the entire school year, as part of the advanced ESOL curriculum. This would be done either by allocating one full day per week or one 55-minute period daily. If either of these are approved, some changes to the project would be appropriate.

First, mentors would be rotated periodically so that more school personnel could participate. Students would also have the opportunity to work with different mentors and departments, thus expanding the range of linguistic

possibilities. Second, there would be more involvement with the vocational programs on campus, possibly by having ESOL students briefly "shadow" teachers and students in these programs, in order to acquaint ESOL students with possible career training choices. Third, liasons with various community service groups would enable students to volunteer off-campus with such organizations as animal shelters, Meals on Wheels, the public library, and elder services.

The district's ESOL Supervisor has been apprised of the results of this project and is considering recommendation for county-wide use. The program would be appropriate for use in secondary schools and with adults. If adopted by the district, a workshop for participating teachers and expanded publication of the Teachers' Manual for an ESOL Volunteer Program would be necessary. The workshop would be brief, since the manual is self-explanatory, and district ESOL teacher meetings would provide sufficient time for any necessary instruction in or discussion of the manual.

During the final class discussion, the target group students made the suggestion that for the first few weeks of participation in the program, students be given a specific oral communication assignment each week. These assignments would be presented orally by individual students to the rest of the class during the regular Friday meetings. Suggested assignments were: to give a job description of the mentor's

position, to give a brief biography of the mentor, to learn a joke from the mentor and relate it to the rest of the class, or to describe any plaques or cartoons on the walls of the mentor's work area and explain these to the rest of the class. These assignments would not only help mentors and students become acquainted, but would be additional linguistic practice. This suggestion will be incorporated into future use of the volunteer program.

References

Andrews, L. (1998). Language exploration and awareness: a resource book for teachers. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Badway, N. (1998). Extent, quality and access for integrated curriculum in community colleges. Journal of Vocational Education Research,23, 133-45.

Baugh, J. (1993). Chicano English: the anguish of definition. In L.M. Cleary & M.D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics for teachers (pp.198-207). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Brice, A. & Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (1999). Turning frustration into success for English learners. Educational Leadership,56, 53-5.

Brown, H.D. (1994a). Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, H.D. (1994b). Teaching by principles. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Carrier, K. (1999). The social environment of second language listening: does status play a role in comprehension?. The Modern Language Journal,83, 65-79.

Cheatham, J.B., Colvin, R.J., & Laminack, L.L. (1993). Tutor: a collaborative approach to literacy instruction. Syracuse, NY: Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc.

Coley, S. & Scheinberg, C. (1990). Proposal writing. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Coomber, J. & Peet, H.D. (1993). Vocabulary teaching: active involvement in contexts. In L.M. Cleary & M.D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics for teachers (pp.577-89). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Coulter, B. & Hatala, C. (1997). Vocabulary connections. Austin, TX: Steck-Vaughn.

Crystal, D. (1995). The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Expressways placement test. (1998). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Finocchiaro, M. (1989). English as a second foreign language. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Freeman, D. & Freeman, Y.S. (1993). A road to success for language-minority high school students. In L.M. Cleary & M.D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics for teachers (pp.612-23). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gregson, J.A. (1996). Continuing the discourse: problems, politics and possibilities of vocational curriculum. Journal of Vocational Education Research,v21, 35-96.

Hansman, C.A., Grant, D.F., Jackson, M.H., & Spencer, L.E. (1999). Implications of students' world views in graduate professional preparation programs. Education,119, 551-9.

Huggins, K. (1992). Workplace written communications. Rochester City, NY: Finger Lakes Education Center.

Hughes, A. (1995). Testing for language teachers. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Jacoby, S. & Goldschmidt, P. (1998). Education, skill, and wage inequality. Challenge,41, 88-91.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1996). The foundations of dual language instruction. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Mayher, J. (1993). How the system is used to make meaning. In L.M. Cleary & M.D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics for teachers (pp.564-77). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McCracken, N.M. (1993). Placing meaning at the center of language study. In L.M. Cleary & M.D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics for teachers (pp.554-64). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Molinsky, S. & Bliss, B. Expressways. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Murphy, C. (1985). Challenger. Syracuse, NY: Laubach Literacy International.

Nattinger, J.R. (1993). Communicative language teaching. In L.M.Cleary & M.D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics for teachers (pp.599-612). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Nwandiora, E. & McAdoo, H. (1996). Acculturative stress among Amerasian refugees: gender and racial differences. Adolescence,31,477-87.

O'Keefe, V. (1995). Speaking to think, thinking to speak. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Okoli, E.J. (1994, April). The concept of culture and sojourner assimilation into the host environment: an example foreign students in the United States. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Office for the Study of Automotive Transportation. (1996, July). The education and employee gap (Issue Brief No.7). Cincinnati, OH: Author.

Pierce, L.V. & O'Malley, J.M. (1992). Performance and portfolio assessment for language minority students. Washington, DC: Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Short, D.J. (1991). How to integrate language and content instruction. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Sturtevant, E. (1998). What middle and high school educators need to know about language minority students. NASSP Bulletin,82, 73-77.

Tchudi,S. & Mitchell,D. (1999). Exploring and teaching the language arts. New York, NY: Longman.

Tetreault, P.A. (1997). Preparing students for work. Adult Learning,8, 10-13.

Weaver, C. (1996). Teaching grammar in context. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Whitson, K. (1998). Key skills and curriculum reform. Studies in Higher Education,23, 307-17.

Yang, Y. (1999). Reflection on English teaching and learning in China: a case study of two Chinese students in their first semester at Harvard. International Education,28, 31-44.

Appendixes

Appendix A

Academic Skills Literacy

Completion (LCP) Checklist

(INSTITUTION)
Adult ESOL Advanced LCP-F

Student _____	Entry Date_____	Instructor(s)_____	Site_____
I.D. # _____	Withdrawal Date_____	_____	_____

Please check corresponding box (☑) and complete date as each standard is achieved. Standards #86.0 through #102.0

The student is able to...
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SKILLS
☐ *86.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO OBTAIN EMPLOYMENT...* *Date Achieved _____/_____/_____*
86.01 Plan a career path and develop a portfolio. which may include resume, cover letter, professional recognitions, awards, certificates, etc.
86.02 Interpret want ads, job announcements and networking
86.03 Present a positive image (dress, grooming, body language) and ask and answer a variety of questions in a job interview simulation and a follow-up call.
86.04 Demonstrate understanding of job specifications, policies, standards, benefits and complete IRS form(s).
☐ *87.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN EMPLOYMENT...* *Date Achieved: _____/_____/_____*
87.01 Demonstrate understanding of U.S. work ethic (appropriate behavior attire, attitudes and social interactions that effect job retention).
87.02 Communicate with supervisor and co-workers, orally and in writing, regarding work related tasks and problems - write memos, report forms, etc. - give and follow instructions - ask/respond to apologies/criticism - identify problems, solutions, consequences.
87.03 Demonstrate an understanding of work performance evaluations.
87.04 Demonstrate an understanding and discusses worker's rights (compensation, unionization, right to work).
87.05 Demonstrate an understanding of safety procedures ("Right to Know", OSHA)

☐ *88.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT...* *Date Achieved: _____/_____/_____*
88.01 Demonstrate an understanding of the concept of job advancement including job postings and vacant listings.
88.02 Update resume and locate information about educational services that will assist in career advancement.
88.03 Write an action plan for achieving goals and requesting a promotion or raise and identifying personal strengths and weaknesses.
88.04 Demonstrate ability to apply a variety of test taking strategies (multiple choice, true/false, doze and essay).
☐ *89.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO ACCESS APPLIED TECHNOLOGY...* *Date Achieved: _____/_____/_____*
89.01 Demonstrate knowledge of operating equipment necessary for home and work.
LIFE SKILLS
☐ *90.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVE INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION...* *Date Achieved _____/_____/_____*
90.01 Demonstrate good comprehension during face to face conversation by verbally responding.
90.02 Use appropriate language for social, academic, and life situations, demonstrating sensitivity to gender and cultural bias including voice volume and proper body language.
90.03 Identify bias, prejudice or propaganda in oral messages and print materials.
☐ *91.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVE TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION...* *Date Achieved _____/_____/_____*
91.01 Take accurate written notes and give complete verbal reports from recorded messages.

91.02 Demonstrate ability to give and request information clearly by telephone.
☐ *92.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY ON HEALTH AND NUTRITION TOPICS...* *Date Achieved _____/_____/_____*
92.01 Recognize problems related to substance/drug abuse, and identify where treatment may be obtained.
92.02 Ask for/give advice related to nutrition and good health habits.
92.03 Recognize and apply practices relating to personal hygiene and grooming.
☐ *93.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND U.S. CONCEPTS OF TIME AND MONEY AND HOW TO USE THESE SKILLS TO FUNCTION...* *Date Achieved _____/_____/_____*
93.01 Reconcile a bank statement.
93.02 Use appropriate banking terms when inquiring about banking services.
93.03 Develop a monthly budget.
☐ *94. 0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO ACCESS TRANSPORTATION AND TRAVEL...* *Date Achieved _____/_____/_____*
94.01 Plan a trip determining cost of schedules and time factor.
94.02 Demonstrate appropriate response when stopped by law enforcement officers (ask/answer questions regarding traffic violations).
94.03 Describe appropriate responses to transportation problems (canceled flights, road emergencies).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(INSTITUTION)
Adult ESOL Advanced LCP-F

Student _____	Entry Date_____	Instructor(s)_____	Site_____
I.D. # _____	Withdrawal Date_____	_____	_____

Please check corresponding box (☑) and complete date as each standard is achieved. Standards #86.0 through #102.0

☐ *95.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND SAFETY AND SECURITY ISSUES...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
95.01 Demonstrate an understanding of the responsibilities of owning a gun.
☐ *96.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND CONSUMER EDUCATION ISSUES...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
96.01 Identify ways to economize.
☐ *97.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO UTILIZE GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
97.01 Demonstrate understanding of U.S. main holidays and social customs.
97.02 Demonstrate understanding of American system of government (3 branches).
97.03 Demonstrate understanding of trial by jury and other elements in a U.S. court of law (judge, jury, lawyers).
97.04 Request and respond to information from businesses, government and community organizations.
☐ *98.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND ISSUES RELATIVE TO ENVIRONMENT AND THE WORLD...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
98.01 Describe evacuation procedures and agencies available to help in emergencies.
98.02 Compare/contrast environmental issues.
☐ *99.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY FOR FAMILY AND PARENTING...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
99.01 Demonstrate ability to communicate with school staff orally or in writing (parent-teacher conference, PTA, volunteer, illness, bus problems).
99.02 Identify means to access educational opportunities for children (special programs, scholarships, extracurricular activities).
99.03 Develop awareness of acceptable/unacceptable parenting and disciplinary practices.
ACADEMIC SKILLS
☐ *100.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO LISTEN, SPEAK, READ AND WRITE EFFECTIVELY...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
100.01 Use responsive listening, including paraphrasing, summarizing for elaboration and clarification.
100.02 Demonstrate comprehension of classroom lectures and tests.
100.03 Clarify meaning by asking relevant questions, making relevant comments.
100.04 Recognize and use idioms appropriately.
100.05 Use dictionary and/or thesaurus effectively (parts of speech, definitions, pronunciation).
100.06 Demonstrate ability to use textbook effectively (glossary, index, footnotes, table of contents).
100.07 Preview and make predictions prior to reading.
100.08 Recognize and restate the sequence of events in a reading passage.
100.09 Distinguish fact from opinion and draw appropriate inferences and conclusions from a reading passage.
100.10 Identify the main idea, topic sentence, and supporting details in a reading passage .
100.11 Obtain appropriate information from diagrams, tables, graphs or schedules.
100.12 Summarize a reading passage.
100.13 Demonstrate ability to preview, skim, and scan text for content, purpose, and organization of a reading selection.
100.14 Use prewriting strategies, such as, brainstorming, graphic organizers, and outlining.
100.15 Write two or more paragraphs that are focused and organized.
100.16 Draft and revise a composition with introduction, body, and conclusion.
100.17 Edit documents for spelling, punctuation, correct grammar.
100.18 Demonstrate writing for a purpose (business memos, letters, resume.).
100.19 Demonstrate note-taking strategies.
☐ *101.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY TO APPLY STANDARD GRAMMAR STRUCTURES...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
101.01 Use verbs: past continuous, future possessive past perfect, modals, conditionals gerund, participles, infinitives
101.02 Identify parts of speech and use in sentences: nouns: common, proper, plural, possessive pronouns: subject, object, indefinite, possessive reflexive adjectives: possessive, comparative, descriptive– prepositions: time, place adverbs: place, manner, time, frequency
101.03 Use sentence structures: compound and complex sentences, active and passive voice, clauses and phrases direct and indirect speech
☐ *102.0 DEMONSTRATE ENGLISH SKILLS NECESSARY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PRONUNCIATION SKILLS...*
Date Achieved _____/_____/_____
102.01 Produce stress and intonation in phases and sentences.
102.02 Reproduce consonant blends.
102.03 Produce blends diphthongs and digraphs.
102.04 Produce voiced and voiceless sounds.

88

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

Scoring the Expressways Placement Test (EPT)

Placement Guidelines

These guidelines place students in the appropriate level of the *ExpressWays* series as well as in three other Molinsky and Bliss texts — *Foundations, Communicator I,* and *Communicator II.*

	Foundations	ExpressWays				Communicator		More Advanced Texts
		1	2	3	4	I	II	
Oral Test Only	0–5	6–15	16–25	26–36	37–42	43–45	46–48	49–50
Written Test Only	0–5	6–15	16–25	26–36	37–42	43–45	46–48	49–50
Oral & Written Test (Combined Score)	0–10	11–30	31–50	51–72	73–84	85–90	91–96	97–100

Student Placement

Student's Name _____

I.D. Number _____

Oral Test Score _____

Written Test Score _____

Combined Score _____

Class Assignment:

Level: _____ Teacher: _____

© 1998 Prentice Hall Regents
Duplication for classroom use is permitted.

Appendix C

Student Confidence and Usage Survey

Appendix C

Student Confidence and Usage Survey

Student Confidence and Usage Survey

Please answer these questions using this scale: 1=Never; 2=Seldom; 3=Sometimes; 4=Often; 5=Always

_____ 1. When I am in school, I talk to American students.

_____ 2. Outside of school, I use English.

_____ 3. At home, I use English.

_____ 4. Outside of school, I am comfortable when asking a native English speaker I know well for information in English.

_____ 5. I am comfortable having a conversation with native English speakers.

_____ 6. I am comfortable when asking a native English speaker I do not know well for information in English.

_____ 7. I am confident about my English listening skills.

_____ 8. I am confident about my English speaking skills.

Appendix D

Structured Student Interview

Appendix D

Structured Student Interview

Structured Student Interview: Questions

1. Why do you want to learn English?

2. What activities do you have outside of school for which you need to use English?

3. Do you know any ESOL students who are learning English faster than you are? Why do you think this is so?

4. In what specific situations outside of school are you uncomfortable using English?

5. Name some things you could do outside of school to help you learn English better.

Comments:

Appendix E

Target Group Pre-Test Scores

Appendix E

Target Group Pre-Test Scores

Student Number	Native Language	TABE*	EPT-** Written	EPT-** Oral	EPT-** Combined	Survey*** Score
1	Russian	6.7	46	39	85	22
2	Czech	7.2	47	41	88	25
3	Portuguese	7.9	48	40	88	25
4	Spanish	7.5	47	41	88	22
5	Portuguese	8.1	49	44	93	28
6	Spanish	6.9	45	40	85	22
7	French	6.8	45	41	86	24
8	Spanish	7.1	46	40	86	22
9	Spanish	7.8	48	41	89	25
10	Spanish	7.4	47	42	89	24

* Test for Adult Basic Education

** Expressways Placement Test

*** Student Confidence and Usage Survey

Appendix F

Matrix of Activities

Appendix F

Matrix of Activities

Week	Tasks	Materials	Consultative Group	Target Group
Week 1	Mentor interview, Mentor Needs Assess. Student Skills Assess. Explain Daily Activity checklist Correlate student & mentor checklists Introduce mentors & students	Mentor Needs checklist Student Skills checklist Student Daily Activity Checklist	Explanatory interview Needs assessment Assign student tasks	Skills/Preferences checklist Student Daily Activity Checklist
Week 2 through Week 5	Daily monitoring of students & mentors using checklist Friday: class discussion of activities and problems	Student Daily checklists Daily Monitoring checklists	Assign student tasks Supervise tasks	Meet mentors Mon.-Thurs., 12-2;Fri. 12-1 Fri.: class discussion Tasks & checklist
Week 6	Evaluate & adjust strategies by questioning students & mentors Continue procedure of weeks 2-5 with adjustments	Progress evaluation questions Student & Daily checklists	Suggest needed changes Continue work with students	Suggest changes Continue work w/ mentors
Week 7 through Week 11	Same as Weeks 2-5, incorporating adjustments	Same as Weeks 2-5	Same as Weeks 2-5	Same as Weeks 2-5
Week 12	Give students 2 post-tests Final Evaluation to mentors & students Compile Teacher's Manual	Post-tests Evaluations for students & mentors Teacher Manual evaluation	Mentor Evaluations	Take 2 post-tests Evaluations Discussion: changes?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix G

Mentor Needs Assessment Checklist

Appendix G

Mentor Needs Assessment Checklist

Mentor Needs Assessment Checklist

Mentor Name _____

Department and Location _____

_____

Telephone Extension # _____

Proposed Tasks for Student Volunteers:

Skills Student Needs to Perform Tasks:

Appendix H

Student Skills and Preferences Checklist

Appendix H

Student Skills and Preferences Checklist

Student Skills and Preferences Checklist

Student Name _____

Diplomas/Degrees Received in Native Country_____

_____

_____

Specific Job Training/ Experience in Native Country_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Tasks You Would Like to Do as a Volunteer_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix I

Student Daily Activity Checklist

Appendix I

Student Daily Activity Checklist

Student Name_____ Week Of_____

Student Daily Activity Checklist

	Speaking	Listening	Problems
Monday			
Tuesday			
Wednesday			
Thursday			
Friday			

Appendix J

Daily Monitoring Checklist

Appendix J

Daily Monitoring Checklist

Daily Monitoring Checklist

Student Name_____

Mentor Name & Department_____

Week Of_____

	Activities Observed	Problems Discussed	Positive Feedback
Monday			
Tuesday			
Wednesday			
Thursday			
Friday			

Comments:

Appendix K

Mentor's Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Appendix K

Mentor's Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Mentor's Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Mentor Name_____ Date_____

Department_____ Phone_____

Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, please answer the following:

1. The student was cooperative in performing tasks. _____
2. The student was helpful to me in performing my job. _____
3. The student relieved me of time-consuming tasks. _____
4. I noticed an improvement in the student's speaking skills during the project period. _____
5. I noticed an improvement in the student's listening skills during the project period. _____
6. I noticed an improvement in the student's self-confidence in using oral communication skills during the project period, _____
7. I would be willing to participate in this project again. _____

COMMENTS:

Appendix L

Student Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Appendix L

Student Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Student Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Student Name_____ Date_____

Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, please answer the following:

1. My mentor explained tasks clearly. _____
2. I was able to perform the tasks requested. _____
3. My mentor helped me with my speaking skills. _____
4. My mentor helped me with my listening skills. _____
5. I notice an improvement in my speaking skills. _____
6. I notice an improvement in my listening skills. _____
7. After participating in this project, I feel more confident in my oral communication skills. _____
8. If I had the opportunity, I would participate in a similar project again. _____
9. I will be able to use this experience in advancing my career goals and opportunities. _____

COMMENTS:

Appendix M

Teacher's Manual Rating Questionnaire

Appendix M

Teacher's Manual Rating Questionnaire

Teacher's Manual Rating Questionnaire

You are asked to rate the Teacher's Manual for an ESOL Volunteer Program using a Likert scale as follows:

1= Unacceptable
2= Below Average
3= Average
4= Good
5= Superior

Please consider these questions:

1. The Manual is written clearly and directions are understandable.
2. The program could be helpful in improving speaking and listening skills for advanced ESOL students.
3. The program could be helpful in increasing self-confidence in oral communication skills for advanced ESOL students.
4. The program is feasible and could be replicated in other settings.

Overall rating based on the Likert scale, above: _____

COMMENTS:

Appendix N

Comparison of Students' Pre- and Post-Test Scores

Appendix N

Comparison of Students' Pre- and Post-Test Scores

	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
Student #	Speaking EPT* Pre-Test	Listening EPT* Pre-Test	Survey** Pre-Test	Speaking EPT* Post-Test	Listening EPT* Post-Test	Survey** Post-Test
1	39	39	22	41	41	24
2	41	41	25	45	45	33
3	40	40	25	44	44	32
4	41	41	22	46	46	30
5	44	44	28	49	49	37
6	40	40	22	45	45	31
7	41	41	24	46	46	35
8	40	40	22	44	44	30
9	41	41	25	45	45	33
10	42	42	24	47	47	34
Target Group Average	40.9	40.9	23.0	45.2	45.2	31.9

* EPT= Expressways Placement Test

** Survey= Student Confidence and Usage Survey (Appendix C)

Appendix O

Teachers' Manual

Appendix O

Teachers' Manual

Teachers' Manual

An ESOL Volunteer Program

for Improving Advanced Students' Oral Communication Skills

What's It All About?

The speaking and listening skills of advanced ESOL students are often well below their reading and writing skills. This may be particularly true of students who have studied English prior to coming to the U.S. with teachers who were not native English speakers. Often these teachers place more emphasis on grammar and vocabulary as used in reading and writing exercises, but, because of a lack of confidence or experience with their own speaking/listening skills, shy away from these areas with their students. Whatever the reasons, students themselves often ask for help in improving speaking and listening skills, which, in turn, increase students' confidence in their own abilities to communicate with native English speakers.

Many ESOL students report that they have experienced impatient, even rude, responses to their communicative efforts from native English speakers outside of school. This further undermines student confidence and often leads them to avoid attempts at real-world oral communication, even though this experience would strengthen and improve speaking and listening.

Through the ESOL Volunteer Program, students concentrate on oral skills in a protected environment free from ridicule or harsh criticism so they can gain both proficiency and confidence. The difference between the usual self-contained classroom drill or practice and the volunteer program is that

classroom drills, however well-planned and executed, are simulations, and not the "real thing". By pairing students and mentors outside the classroom, using personnel and facilities or departments within the school itself, students participate in real-life activities with sympathetic partners in an authentic setting which is transitional to life outside of school. Also, students are exposed to a greater variety of English accents and pronunciations.

There are other advantages to both students and mentors. Mentors receive badly needed help with routine and time-consuming tasks, since students are acting as aides or assistants to the mentors. In addition to improving oral proficiency and confidence, students can use this experience in the business side of school on their resumes. This is of particular value to those students who may return to their native countries where not only bi-lingualism but experience or association with American enterprises are highly valued.

The pilot program for this project showed conclusively that participating students improved their speaking and listening proficiency by two grade levels and their confidence level by 23%, after only 12 weeks.

The original project took place on a large campus comprised of an adult high school and the district's vocational/technical school. Mentors, who responded to a memo introducing the the project's purpose, came from clerical, business and financial offices within the school as well as from guidance and

academic/vocational departments. Students acted as assistants to these mentors, performing routine tasks which emphasized use of oral skills. After only a few weeks, students and mentors formed friendships, which further strengthened students' confidence, and often led to shared cultural or social activities outside of school. This further eased the students' transition from school to real world.

Suggestions for implementing this program in your school are described in the next section. Reproducible forms may be found at the end of this manual.

How to Go About It

First, the idea must be presented to instructional and non-instructional personnel in your own school, to find potential mentors. This is best done through a faculty meeting where a description of the project and a question period can be presented. Potential mentors may also be found through a descriptive memo followed by individual personal contact. When mentors are identified, they should fill out the Mentor Needs Assessment (Form 1).

Next, advanced ESOL students should be informed about the project and its benefits and asked to volunteer to participate. These participants should fill out Student Skills and Preferences (Form 2). The Daily Activity Checklist (Form 3) can be explained. Also at this time, if desired, pre-tests for later

evaluative purposes can be given. The Student Confidence and Usage Survey (Form 4) may be used as both pre-test and post-test.

Pairing of students and mentors are based on responses to the Mentor Needs Assessment and the Student Skills and Preferences, as well as consideration of the personalities of the participants. It is helpful for students to write a brief autobiography including information about their native country and language, and interesting background experiences. With students' permission, these autobiographies can be given to the paired mentors before face-to-face introductions are made so that mentors know something about the student they'll be working with. Students and mentors should be introduced to each other individually by the implementing teacher. A few minutes can be spent getting acquainted, and then the mentor should familiarize the student with the task site and explain the tasks to be done.

Once the pairing is accomplished, the project should not be overly time-consuming for either the implementing teacher or the mentors. Mentors' tasks are simply to provide explanations of what needs to be done and brief instruction on how to do it. Students should fill out the Daily Activities Checklist, which will be used during student group discussions.

In the original 12-week project, students and mentors worked together for two hours daily, in the afternoon, Monday through Thursday. On Friday, students worked with mentors for

one hour, then returned to the regular classroom for group discussion of any problems that occurred that week, as well as positive things that happened. However, other time frames are possible. The program could be extended to cover an entire semester with students and mentors working together for one hour daily. Or a specific day each week could be set aside for this. The program is flexible for scheduling, but it is important for the entire group of participating students to meet together periodically for discussion of problems and progress. The implementing teacher also needs to visit each student/mentor pair at their task site on a regular basis, and use the Monitoring Checklist (Form 5) for evaluation, and check for any problems or questions.

If at any time there is a problem with either student or mentor being dissatisfied with tasks required or the performance of these, or if there should be personal considerations that necessitate new student/mentor pairings, there should first be discussion with the student and/or mentor to attempt to resolve the problem. If this discussion fails to resolve the problem, there should be a new pairing.

Evaluation of the program's success can be done in several ways. Pre-tests and post-tests can be administered to check speaking and listening proficiency, and students' levels of confidence can be checked before and after participation by using the Student Confidence and Usage Survey (From 4). Students' and mentors' evaluations of the program can be done using Forms 6 and 7.

This volunteer program has been shown to be successful in raising oral proficiency scores as well as increasing student confidence. It is important that mentors understand that students not only need to be busy, but also should have many opportunities for using oral skills. Students can carry messages, serve as translators, answer phones, and act as receptionists for their task sites. But perhaps one of the most important benefits of this project is that all of those with whom the students are in contact begin to understand the problems that LEP students face, and learn to respect their efforts and diversities.

Form 1

Mentor Needs Assessment Checklist

Mentor Name _____

Department and Location _____

_____

Telephone Extension # _____

Proposed Tasks for Student Volunteers:

Skills Student Needs to Perform Tasks:

Form 2

Student Skills and Preferences Checklist

Student Name _____

Diplomas/Degrees Received in Native Country_____

_____

_____

Specific Job Training/ Experience in Native Country_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Tasks You Would Like to Do as a Volunteer_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Form 3

Student Daily Activity Checklist

Student Name_____ Week Of_____

Student Daily Activity Checklist

	Speaking	Listening	Problems
Monday			
Tuesday			
Wednesday			
Thursday			
Friday			

Form 4

Student Confidence and Usage Survey

Please answer these questions using this scale: 1=Never; 2=Seldom; 3=Sometimes; 4=Often; 5=Always

_____ 1. When I am in school, I talk to American students.

_____ 2. Outside of school, I use English.

_____ 3. At home, I use English.

_____ 4. Outside of school, I am comfortable when asking a native English speaker I know well for information in English.

_____ 5. I am comfortable having a conversation with native English speakers.

_____ 6. I am comfortable when asking a native English speaker I do not know well for information in English.

_____ 7. I am confident about my English listening skills.

_____ 8. I am confident about my English speaking skills.

Form 5

Monitoring Checklist

Student Name_____

Mentor Name & Department_____

Week Of_____

	Activities Observed	Problems Discussed	Positive Feedback
Monday			
Tuesday			
Wednesday			
Thursday			
Friday			

Comments:

Form 6

Student Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Student Name_____ Date_____

Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, please answer the following:

1. My mentor explained tasks clearly. _____
2. I was able to perform the tasks requested. _____
3. My mentor helped me with my speaking skills. _____
4. My mentor helped me with my listening skills. _____
5. I notice an improvement in my speaking skills. _____
6. I notice an improvement in my listening skills. _____
7. After participating in this project, I feel more confident in my oral communication skills. _____
8. If I had the opportunity, I would participate in a similar project again. _____
9. I will be able to use this experience in advancing my career goals and opportunities. _____

COMMENTS:

Form 7

Mentor's Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Mentor Name_____ Date_____

Department_____ Phone_____

Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, please answer the following:

1. The student was cooperative in performing tasks. _____
2. The student was helpful to me in performing my job. _____
3. The student relieved me of time-consuming tasks. _____
4. I noticed an improvement in the student's speaking skills during the project period. _____
5. I noticed an improvement in the student's listening skills during the project period. _____
6. I noticed an improvement in the student's self-confidence in using oral communication skills during the project period, _____
7. I would be willing to participate in this project again. _____

COMMENTS:

Appendix P

Results: Mentors' Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Appendix P

Results: Mentors' Final Evaluation Questionnaire*

Questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Mentor #								
1	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	34
2	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	33
3	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	33
4	5	3	3	4	4	5	4	28
5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	33
6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
7	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	34
8	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	32
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
10	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	34
							Mentor Average Score	33.1

* Questionnaire: see Appendix K

Appendix Q

Results: Students' Final Evaluation Questionnaire

Appendix Q

Results: Students' Final Evaluation Questionnaire*

Questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Student #										
1	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	32
2	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	41
3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	45
4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	40
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	45
6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	45
7	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	36
8	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	43
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	45
10	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	39
								Student Average Score		41.1

* Questionnaire: see Appendix L